

THE

# ECLECTIC REVIEW

FOR APRIL, 1848.

---

- ART. I.—1. *A Defence of Capital Punishment.* By the Rev. George B. Cheever, D.D. *And an Essay on the Ground and Reason of Punishment, with Special Reference to the Penalty of Death.* By Tayler Lewis, Esq. New York: Wiley and Putnam. 1846.
2. *On Punishment and Prisons.* By Oscar, King of Sweden.
3. *Letters on Capital Punishment.* By Charles Dickens. ‘Daily News.’ 1846.
4. *Capital Punishments Unnecessary in a Christian State.* By the Rev. Henry Christmas, M.A. London: Smith, Elder and Co.
5. *The Punishment of Death Scriptural, Moral, and Salutary.* By Walter Scott, President and Theological Tutor in Airdale College, Bradford, Yorkshire. London: Simpkin and Co. 1846.
6. *Capital Punishment binding on the Civil Ruler.* By Henry John Neale Chase. London: Hamilton, Adams and Co.
7. *A Plea for the Abolition of Capital Punishment.* By the Rev. Thomas Pyne, M.A. London: C. Gilpin.
8. *The Punishment of Death Reviewed.* By Frederic Rowton. London: C. Gilpin.
9. *Two Orations against taking away Human Life under any Circumstances.* By Thomas Cooper, the Chartist. London: Chapman.
10. *Report of Speeches delivered before the Town Council of Edinburgh,* by Messrs. Russell and Cruickshank. Edinburgh: Oliphant. 1845.
11. *Crime and Punishment.* By Lord Nugent, M.P. ‘People’s Journal.’

Of all the Scripture prophecies yet unfulfilled, there is none to which the soul of man turns with such intense anticipation, and on which it relies with such steady and ardent belief, as the

reiterated prediction that the world is to enjoy a period of perfect peace and happiness, when 'there shall not be war any more,' and 'when men shall not hurt nor *destroy* in all God's holy mountain.'

The assurance that such a period will unfailingly come is not only made in the strongest terms in many portions of Holy Writ, and regarded with the clearest hope by the instinctive moral sense of man, but the course of the world's history seems plainly to promise us its accomplishment. The propagation of the gospel, the progress of civilization and refinement, the development and growth of just and benevolent principles, the spread of 'peace on earth,' the gradual amelioration of man's physical, mental, and moral condition, the extension of fraternising and philanthropic influences over the world, and the other great signs of the times, significantly indicate that a period of perfection is ultimately to be enjoyed by humanity. Progression points with steady hand towards an End to be attained:—the philosopher, the poet, and the divine, alike promise us a Millennium.

As this great period approaches nearer and nearer to its consummation, obstacle after obstacle inconsistent with it gives way, crumbles and disappears. Empires which have served the purposes for which they were raised, dynasties which have done their appointed tasks, institutions which have accomplished the ends for which they had existence, creeds and sentiments by which no more service can be wrought, and codes of laws, religious, moral, political and social, which have answered the necessities for which they were formed, pass away, and give place to more appropriate and seasonable workers. The Roman empire, the religion of the sword, the feudal institutions, the rack, the inquisition, the Smithfield fire-pile, the sentiment of chivalry,—all are gone, to return no more. There was doubtless good of some sort in them, or they had never been; and whilst there was good in them, they lasted; but when they ceased to do good, they perished. So must it be with all things that are inconsistent with perfection.

In our own day a mighty step has been taken towards the great end. WAR has received its deathblow amongst civilized nations. Public opinion has finally condemned it; and though its 'pride, pomp, and circumstance,' may continue for a few brief years to dazzle the eyes of the unreflecting, the warrior will never again be the idol of the world. 'His kingdom is taken from him.'

The next great obstacle to fall is THE GALLows. It has had its day, and it has done its work: the time has now come to abolish it,—or at least to demonstrate its worthlessness prepara-

tory to its abolition. The pain of death has been of use,—who shall doubt it? but the universal mind has passed, or is now passing, that point where its value ceases. A very few years, less than a quarter of a century, we predict, will see it abolished throughout Christian Europe. Its defenders are daily becoming fewer, and only a very limited portion of the community can now be found to maintain it even for the extreme crime of murder.

We have refrained from discussing the important and interesting topic of Capital Punishment until now, because we have thought that the public mind was not sufficiently ripe for debating it: and it is the state of the public mind that must, after all, finally determine the question. But the publication of the works named at the head of this article, and the intense excitement prevailing in many parts of Europe on the subject, sufficiently prove to us, that the moment has arrived when the well-wisher to his species must speak out, and fear not.

The books before us show that the question of capital punishment has penetrated into every class of the civilised community. We have here, not merely the extremes, but every gradation of the social scale. A monarch, a nobleman, a doctor of divinity, two Edinburgh baillies, a popular novel-writer, several clergymen of various denominations, a theological tutor, a chartist, and a country-gentleman, are amongst the writers who present themselves for review. Moreover, the subject is discussed in parliament; public meetings are held to debate it; societies are daily forming to urge it; our newspapers take it up; our magazines, legal and literary, gravely consider it. What clearer proof could there be, that the time for its final discussion and settlement is come?

There are other circumstances which show that decision upon this topic presses. The dislike of inflicting death begins to corrupt, or perhaps we should rather say to mislead, our rulers, judges, and jurymen. Convicted murderers, like Dalmas, are snatched from the gallows by royal interference;\* criminals of the deepest dye (such as duellists and child-murderers,) are rescued from punishment by the interposition of our judges; and wretches whose guilt is beyond all legal doubt are acquitted by our jurors. Dislike is raised against the law and its ministers; crime is encouraged; and the standard of morality is lowered and perverted.

We think there is no question that public feeling is against the gallows. Sometimes the judge expresses it: it was but the other day that an eminent Irish judge was so affected in passing

\* Out of 49 persons condemned to death in 1845 only 12 were executed.

sentence of death on a criminal, that he covered his face with his hands, and shed tears and sobbed like a child. Sometimes it is the jury that proves it: not only is it frequently the case that persons absolutely refuse to serve as jurymen in capital cases, but it continually happens that, before a verdict is returned, the jurymen inquire of the judge what *the consequences* will be?—and if they become assured that the word ‘guilty’ will be followed by the infliction of death, they return a verdict of ‘acquittal.’ And a clearer proof still exists in the fact, that the individual who is hired to execute the sentence of the law is so great an object of popular abhorrence, that people shrink from him as from a pestilence. Now, it is not reasonable to suppose, that the law will be approved, of which the minister is abhorred. It must be clear, we repeat, that public feeling does not support the punishment. On what, then, is it founded? ‘Dead in the sympathy of mankind, it rests solely upon the argument of tradition and the fear of change.’ We repeat, therefore, that the time for the discussion and settlement of this vitally important topic is come.

Now we are not of those who maintain that the infliction of death by man on man as a penalty for crime, must in the very nature of things be unjustifiable in all ages and under any circumstances. We agree with the very able writer on this subject in the ‘Topic,’ when he says—‘We are no more entitled to protest against the punishment of death in *the abstract* than we are warranted to plead its universal application.’ Seeing that the Most High unquestionably approved, nay commanded, the infliction of death among the Jews, only a downright infidel can argue that this penalty must through all times be unjustifiable. We believe that up to a certain point in the history of a community—in the history of *every* community—the threat of death operates as a restraint upon the commission of crime. To barbarous minds Death is, indeed, ‘the King of Terrors;’ and whilst the moral remains inferior to the physical in human nature, the fear of bodily suffering will ever be a safe principle to appeal to. Physical force being then the predominating idea, and might being then held to be right, physical pain is the kind of punishment most dreaded: and death, the extreme of physical pain, will naturally be the severest and most dreaded of penalties. Let it not be thought, then, that we are about to join the ranks of those thoughtless declaimers, who assert in defiance at once of Divine authority and of the world’s experience, that capital punishment must always have been, and must always be, in its very nature Murder; and that all who have defended, and do defend it, must have been, and must be, wilful murderers.

Nor would we have it imagined that we ask for the abolition of the pain of death, because we entertain undue sentiments of pity or compassion towards criminals, or a false idea of the intrinsic demerit of crime. In the sentimental sham-benevolence of the day (likened by Mr. Carlyle to ‘patent treacle’ and ‘universal rose-water’) we have neither part nor lot. We abhor crime as much as crime can be abhorred; and we should be the last to clog the hand of law in its endeavours to restrain the malefactors who infringe the peace which it is established to preserve. It is not for the criminal, but for society, that we plead.

We have admitted that, up to a certain point in the social history of every community, the punishment of death is calculated to restrain men from committing crime; and, on the other hand, we now as unhesitatingly affirm, that after that point has been once reached, the penalty of death not only fails to restrain from crime, but actually incites men to perpetrate it.

When the moral becomes stronger than the physical in a nation’s mind, then the infliction of pain upon the body naturally ceases to be as great a terror as it was before; and mental pain—the pain of conscience—becomes a greater punishment by far. Suicides, heroes and martyrs are never found amongst savages. Moreover, when a civilised state of society is reached, the infliction of pain upon the body is felt to be unjust and unwise and childish. As we grow enlightened, we become aware that it is the soul that sins, not the body—that the intrinsic crime consists in the motive, not in the act; and the torture of the body for the sin of the soul is naturally thought to be as absurd as it is found to be unavailing.

When a child is too young to be reasoned with, personal chastisement operates in a salutary manner in restraining him from bad conduct; but when the child is grown old enough to understand and to feel conscientiously, it is found, not only that personal chastisement is useless to him, but that he despises and laughs at it. It is by representation, by persuasion, by affectionate remonstrance, and above all by educating the conscience in moral and religious truth, that you are able to work upon him most effectually.

Just so with a state. When young it must be restrained and corrected physically, because that is the kind of punishment which it then most fears. When, however, it is old enough to judge, to think, and to feel—when, in other words, it is morally civilised—it must be restrained and corrected morally; and physical punishment only hardens, depraves, and corrupts it. In an age of civilization, the lash, the sword, the gibbet, and the rack are found to be totally useless as deterrents from crime: it is to knowledge, to reflection, to philosophy, to benevolence, to peace, to conscientiousness, and to the religious sentiment

that we must look, as our only means to stop the progress of vice.

We think it will now be clear, from reason, experience, and the testimony of revelation, that there is a point where all physical correction must give way to moral, and that therefore the punishment of death, however useful it may have been in the early ages of society, is not intended to last for ever. Few persons, we fancy, would be disposed to assert the contrary. The stoutest defenders of capital punishment continually admit that ‘a time may come when the death-penalty can be safely discontinued;’ and legislation is evidently pointing the same way as popular belief. This point admitted at the outset, we shall be saved many difficulties in the course of the discussion which we propose to institute. The supporter of capital punishment will see that his strongest arguments *must* at some time or other become unavailing, and that they may, consequently, be unavailing now; and the abolitionist will be saved the appearance of charging, first, the Almighty with folly in originally ordaining these inflictions; and, secondly, the followers of the commands with wickedness in enforcing them.

The question then which we have mainly to try is, whether the penalty of death is found to be now practically successful in restraining men from crime. Death is at length inflicted solely for the offence of murder; and we have to inquire whether the purpose is accomplished by the means.

We are prepared to show that it is *not*.

But here we are met at the outset by Mr. Tayler Lewis, whose ‘Essay on the Ground and Reason of Punishment’ is the most elaborate, most talented, and we will add, most sophistical defence of the penalty of death that we have yet read. We are told by this writer that expediency *must not* be the rule of human punishment—that although ‘reformation and prevention should have a most prominent and important place in the scheme of human government, yet they should ever be held (as in Divine legislation) subordinate to the higher principle of *retribution*.’ In other words, Mr. Tayler Lewis argues, that in punishing crime, the ruler is bound to have regard more to its intrinsic demerit than to its consequences on society. We are not at liberty, therefore, it would seem, to judge this question as one of expediency, because we are bound first to satisfy the higher claims of moral justice. Punishment should be (according to Mr. Lewis) ‘not so much a means for deterring other men from crime through the example of the penalty inflicted,’ as ‘the infliction of pain upon sin for its own *intrinsic demerit*’—‘the infliction of suffering for crime as *crime*, irrespective of antecedents, collaterals, and consequents.’ ‘Punishment,’ he goes on to say, ‘is properly a *satis-*

*faction, or even a compensation, of justice.'* Dr. Cheever, too, quoting (and often misquoting) Grotius and a host of other learned authorities, contends that punishment should be inflicted upon the Rhadamanthean ground, that 'evil felt balances evil committed.' And even Mr. Scott argues for the retention of the pain of death for murder upon the principle that murder '*deserves* death.' Now we conceive that the theory of human punishment, thus put forth, is one of the most dangerous doctrines that human sophistry can preach; and feeling this, we trust the reader will pardon us for entering somewhat fully into its consideration.

The chief ground upon which Mr. Tayler Lewis (for we select him as our strongest opponent) builds his theory of pain for sin, is that derived from the Divine example. The Almighty inflicts pain for sin, says he, and *therefore* man should. Now, deferring our consideration of this logic for a moment, we would take leave here to observe, that Mr. Lewis, and all who write on the same side, are forced to sacrifice to one of the Divine attributes all the rest. They see in the Creator only the stern, awful, and inexorable JUDGE, armed with penalties and thunderbolts, and unable, as well as unwilling, to forgive. 'Law and retaliation,' 'the sternness of the Divine justice,' and 'retributive vengeance,' are the chief ideas which these writers put forth upon the subject; and we must say that they urge them vastly too much in the spirit of those over-zealous apostles, who were rebuked by the Son of Man for calling down 'fire from heaven' to consume the Samaritans. The Book that tells us of the 'justice' of God, speaks of his 'mercy,' too; and Mr. Tayler Lewis would have written less like a pharisee, and more like a Christian, had he urged us to imitate the Almighty's benevolence rather than his vengeance.

Punishment is not an end, but a means. Suffering looks beyond the pain it inflicts. Judgment is not a final principle, but only a component part of the one universal element of Benevolence. While, then, Mr. Tayler Lewis rests upon the idea of penalty as higher than the idea of expediency, we rise to a height far transcending his. He would have it that God is LAW: we reply that God is LOVE. He would tell us that the foundation of the universe is vengeance: we maintain that it is mercy. He affirms that pain for sin is an eternal and absolute principle: we assert, that before there was sin or pain, there was a God of infinite and endless love, and a universe of unsullied purity.

We admit that man should imitate the government of God; but we contend that it should only be in its absolute and eternal

principles. We have no example from the Most High for inflicting a punishment which includes no hope or chance of mercy. The punishment of death by human law has no parallel in the Divine law. God ‘desireth not the death of a sinner, but rather that he should turn from his wickedness and live.’ There is mercy even for the chief of sinners.

But it may be said, that as, beyond all question, judgment has a place in the Divine government, (however inferior it may be to the attribute of mercy), so it must also have a place in human law : that, as God judges the intrinsic demerit of crime, so also should man. This argument is, indeed, the chief basis on which Mr. Tayler Lewis builds.

One need not go far to see that the argument refutes itself. ‘God judges the intrinsic demerit of crime—and, *therefore*, man should do so,’ is the logic of Mr. Lewis. Now, as God is the judge of all the earth, and tells us that *He* will unfailingly recompense every man according to his deeds, is it not perfectly plain and self-evident that there exists *no need* for man to weigh the intrinsic demerit of crime—that, in fact, the scales of justice are held by the hands of a faultless judge already?

The *other* world, not this, is the scene of retribution. Earth was never meant to be a world of reward and punishment ; and no observer of life can have failed to gather proof of this from his own experience. The blindest mortal must have constantly seen that in this life neither the virtuous gets his reward, nor the vicious his penalty. The wicked prosper, and the good suffer, oftentimes from the cradle to the grave ; and one of the strongest arguments in favour of the immortality of the soul is derived from the unquestionable fact, that as it does not receive its desert *here*, it is forced to look to a future. To that future it *does* look ; and we have a moral conviction, as well as a prophetic assurance, that, although man is neither punished nor rewarded in this life, he is unerringly recompensed hereafter ; and that none escapes, or is passed over. Let no man think, then, that the murderer or the criminal, of any sort, can escape due punishment ; he will assuredly receive his doom in the future world, and we need not punish him here under the plea that he will escape if we do not.

All that Mr. Tayler Lewis and his fellow-defenders of the gallows say about the ‘satisfaction’ or ‘compensation’ of justice, is consequently superfluous. Justice is unfailingly satisfied above, and it is not meant to be satisfied here.

We wonder that Mr. Lewis does not see a fatal objection to his argument, that man is bound to make the intrinsic demerit of crime the rule and principle of judgment, in the fact that man *cannot tell* the intrinsic demerit of crime. He cannot see

it, cannot weigh it, cannot ascertain it, and, therefore, cannot possibly make it his rule of judgment and penalty. That man is not meant to satisfy justice, is evident at once from his incompetency to do so. Had he been meant to judge morally, he would have been endowed with proper powers of discernment; and as he is not so endowed, we see plainly that moral judgment is not his province.

It is a singular fact, that whilst men like Mr. Lewis are found to say that moral judgment is man's province, our very judges disclaim the right. At the York Assizes, held July, 1846, the judge thus addressed a criminal, John Rodda, on whom he was passing sentence of death, for the murder of his daughter : '*Human tribunals must always fail when they endeavour to ascertain the motives by which men are stimulated to crime.*' It may have been from the mere weariness of watching over and attending a sick child ; it may have been for pitiful gain ; or it may have been *from motives lying more deep than the mind can fathom.* The facts, however, have been proved against you.'

Real crime consists in evil motive ; sin proceeds from the heart, not from the hand ; and, as the learned judge, just quoted, very properly says, motives cannot be ascertained by human tribunals. No man can read the heart. No man can say how far another is guilty or unfortunate, how much of his crime is due to force of circumstances or extenuating motives, how far hereditary predisposition may have drawn him within that fearful line where fatuity commences and responsibility ends. 'Dr. Forbes Winslow maintains, that what is called insanity, is only the *extreme* and *perceptible* form of nervous suffering ; and that the disease exists in millions where the *overt* insanity is not perceived.' Who can say, then, how much of what we call crime, ought not rather to be laid to the charge of insanity which has not reached its perceptible crisis of development ? Only those who *can* distinguish thus, can be safely permitted to punish the intrinsic demerit of crime.

Nay, they must see more than this. They must not only distinguish between crime and insanity, but they must be able to estimate the strength of temptation, (for he who sins, being but little tempted, is surely more criminal than he who resists till he yields from very weariness) ; they must be able to calculate the force of each and every outward pressure, to follow the immediate up to the originating causes, and to know, so as to link together in one faultless chain, every thought that lies between the first conception and the act of crime. But what man can do this ? Ah, it is altogether vain for humanity to put forth its puny claim ; the attributes are omniscient ones, and only Omnipotence can wield them. How strange it is that

some are still to be found who yet believe the lie of the tempter,—that we are ‘as gods, knowing good and evil!’

Why, men are not yet agreed on what *is* crime and what is *not*. This very crime of murder is the least defined of all. Some deify it—soldiers, for instance; others commit it without blame from men—these we call duellists; others perpetrate it for hire, under the protection of the law—and we name them executioners; others practise it by inches—slaveowners, hard task-masters, cruel slanderers, and the like; others execrate it in the unit, and crown it with laurel in the mass. There is nothing we now call crime which has not in some age of the world been deemed a virtue. There is not a virtue now lauded by mankind that has not, amongst some people, been considered a crime. Our virtues are crimes to others, others’ virtues are crimes to us. Men have been burned for religious faith, glorified for slaying thousands of their fellow-beings, hanged for stealing a loaf to save them from absolute starvation, shot for rising in defence of their homes and liberties, strangled for robbing a man of five-shilling’s worth of property, for breaking down the head of a fish-pond, for destroying a fruit-tree in an orchard,—deified because they have amassed mammon, imprisoned and persecuted even to the death, because they have demonstrated the falseness of old astronomical systems; decked with honour, because they have been politically perfidious; destroyed because they have been too much in earnest to abjure their opinions; nay, the innocent have often been killed by sheer mistake. While history remains, man can never contend that he is fit to punish crime *as crime*. He has assumed the sword of God, and he has wielded it with the blind fury of a savage idiot.

There is another reason why man should not assume the office of moral judge; he is a criminal himself. Those who make this question one of theology, (as Mr. Lewis, Dr. Cheever, Mr. Scott, and, indeed, all who support their conclusions, do), would do well to call to mind that as, by their own showing, all men are depraved by nature, and are lying under the ban of Almighty displeasure, so, by their own admission, no man is qualified to judge his fellow-beings. Till we are without sin ourselves, we are not at liberty to cast a stone at another. We must pull the beam out of our own eye, before we can see the mote in our brother’s. The striking parable of the servant who, after having been forgiven his debt of ten thousand talents by his lord, brought to justice a fellow-servant who owed him a hundred pence, is singularly applicable to us. God, and man, and the criminal, are just in the same relative position. God offers to forgive man his immense debt of original sin, and man

refuses to forgive his fellow-man the far smaller sin committed against him. Sentenced malefactors ourselves at God's justice-bar, we assume God's sword to slay the fellow-sinner standing at our side ! As one of the writers before us well observes : ' If God can forego his justice against our souls, surely we can forego our vengeance against men's bodies.'

The satisfaction or compensation of moral justice, then, is clearly no part of man's duty in punishing crime. First, moral justice is satisfied and compensated before a higher tribunal : secondly, man is not competent to measure the compensation it requires ; and thirdly, being a criminal himself, he is disqualified from awarding its penalties. He must, therefore, leave the satisfaction of justice to the Judge of all the earth, and legislate for crime solely with a view to its effects ; placing before himself simply one end—the prevention of evil to the community he governs ; which object, of course, includes the reformation of the offender.

Thus viewed, expediency does not become, in Mr. Tayler Lewis's words, 'severed from the true idea of retribution,' but dependent upon it. Far from superseding this idea, it confirms it: for, whilst it weighs and punishes the actual evil committed, it still says that there is a higher justice and more certain tribunal before which the moral wickedness of the offence must ultimately go ; a tribunal where guilt can have no chance of escape, and where innocence can have no fear of error. The system which Mr. Lewis advocates,—that of letting the human tribunal inflict the moral penalty—is rather calculated to lower, than to raise, the standard of true morality ; for it arraigns crime before a fallible tribunal, and the award is made by chance, not by discrimination. This will leave crime to hug itself with the idea that it may possibly go unpunished after all : it will sin in secret, and dare the chances of discovery. We contend, therefore, that the true idea of retribution can only be maintained upon the principle that the infallible God administers the awards. There can be no true idea of retribution whilst weak and faulty man is the judge and the executioner.

We are in no wise amenable, then, to the charge which Mr. Lewis brings against the abolitionists of 'endeavouring to destroy whatever is strictly penal in legislation :' we only maintain that the infliction of the moral penalty should be left to an infallible hand, and that all human attempts to arraign and 'judge the consciences of men' will be found to be (as they have ever been) vain and futile.

Mr. Lewis fears, nay, asserts, that 'if it can be made out that there is nothing strictly penal or retributive in human law, deists and infidels will push the argument further, and say, that neither

is there in the Divine.' But this is an utterly groundless dread. When we disclaim the right of man to wield and distribute the penalties of moral guilt, we do not contradict the principle that man should be punished for crime; we merely reserve the judgment for the Divine tribunal. There is (as we have seen) a reason why man should not have the power of inflicting moral penalties—the fact that he cannot discern moral guilt; but there is no such reason why the Deity should not wield them: on the contrary, there is an absolute necessity (so to speak) that He should. The blasphemy of calling the Divine government simply 'a police system' to prevent disorder in the universe, pertains not to us, therefore, but to our opponents.

We think it will now be evident that man, in his judgment of man, must simply estimate outward acts, and leave motive quite out of the question. The word 'RETRIBUTION' must be expunged from his criminal code, and 'PREVENTION' substituted.

But the supporter of capital punishment will say, that although he may not be able to prove his right upon *moral* grounds to wield against his fellow-man the penalties of omniscience, still he conceives that the sword of eternal justice is deputed to him by Omniscience itself: and he will invoke *religion* to support what morality has been unable to establish.

We quite agree with Mr. Tayler Lewis when he says, that 'the real question involved in this discussion is in the highest and deepest sense a religious one.' Were we not so convinced, we should hesitate to employ these pages in this controversy. Certain, however, that the subject can never be settled without taking the religious view of it into consideration, we have no fear that we shall be accused of irreverence when we turn, as we now do, to the scriptural aspect of the whole question.

It is asserted, then, that the Bible contains certain express declarations of God's will upon this matter—which *enjoin* the infliction of death by man upon the murderer, and which are to be binding upon us to the end of time. The destruction of the murderer by the law thus becomes a religious duty, it is urged; and consequently must be enforced, whether it is agreeable to morality or opposed to it, whether it is expedient or baneful in practice.

It seems a wild and singular theory that the one pure and infallible God, the creator, the orderer, the judge of all the earth, the 'Lord to whom vengeance belongeth,' should commit the care of his eternal justice into the hands of weak, finite, short-sighted, fallible, and guilty man; for the purpose, too, of arraigning, judging, and punishing a fellow-being not more intrinsically wicked than himself. To us no theory could seem less probable. The omnipotence and the benevolence of

the Deity alike forbid so monstrous a supposition. And when we find, further, that the theory does not answer in practice—that it increases crime instead of repressing it, that it makes murderers while it endeavours to exterminate them,—we have increased reason to doubt its soundness.

But do you deny the Scriptures? our opponents say. Will you reject the Bible?

By no means: we admit it to be man's best teacher and guide, and we mean to base our chief arguments concerning the matter in hand upon its sacred precepts. We only maintain, that isolated texts must never be put forth as rules of faith and conduct. It should not be forgotten that there has never been an error so monstrous, or a vice so flagrant, that it has not met with defenders who could quote Scripture as fluently as Satan himself in proof of its excellence. The crusades were justified upon religious grounds—the Holy Inquisition was a religious institution—the massacre of the Albigenses was undertaken for religion's sake—Queen Mary and Bishop Bonner lighted their Smithfield bonfires with leaves from the Bible—the massacre of St. Bartholomew was believed to be an acceptable sacrifice to the Divinity—the reformer Calvin persecuted Servetus to death upon religious principles—the presbyterians of Scotland destroyed in less than one century sixty thousand women for the alleged crime of witchcraft upon Bible authority—even in our own time our fellow-citizens are denied equal rights with ourselves, because religion disapproves their creed; and within the last few years books have been written to prove that slavery is a religious institution, and ought never to be abolished. We may well say, in the words of the poet,—

—————‘In religion,  
What awful error but some sober brow  
Will bless it and approve it with a text,—  
Hiding its grossness with fair ornament?’

All this ought to make us very careful how we employ Scripture to judge our fellow-men. These shocking errors were all once as firmly believed to be gospel truths as is the practice of choking the life out of men on the scaffold; and disbelievers in them would have been called (as Mr. Tayler Lewis and Dr. Cheever call those who disagree with them respecting the infliction of death by the law) ‘infidels,’ ‘radicals,’ and ‘ferocious popular demagogues.’

A short way of arriving at the truth of the proposition that the punishment of death is a religious ordinance, is to force the supporters of that idea to carry out their principles, and make the execution of a criminal a religious ceremony. It was so with the Jews, whose law is quoted for our imitation; let it, then,

be so with us. Let the destruction of our culprits take place in our churches, and let our clergymen be the executioners. What religion commands, religion's minister can surely do. Nay, as it was in the holiest of holies, and by the high priest, that sacrifices for sin used to be offered in that olden Hebrew time from which our modern sacrificers seek to copy, let the execution-place now be St. Paul's Cathedral or Westminster Abbey, and let a bishop or an archbishop be the hangman.

It seems to us that the scope and intent of religion are altogether mistaken, when we employ its doctrines and injunctions *against* our fellow-creatures. Religion is a matter between man and God, not between man and *man*. No man has a right to judge another *in* religion, or *by* religion. The office of religion is to lead a man to make his own peace with God, not to set him up as judge and executioner of his brother sinner. Religion ought never to be pleaded as our reason for condemning and punishing one another; our religion is a rule for ourselves, but should never become the law *by* which we arraign our brethren.

But, quitting generalities, let us consider the special arguments by which the punishment of death is scripturally defended.

First of all, we, of course, have the oft-quoted passage from *Genesis*, ix. 6, ‘Whoso sheddeth man’s blood, by man shall his blood be shed;’—‘one of the planets,’ as Dr. Cheever calls it, ‘in the firmament of revealed truth’—‘the gift of God to a christianized humanity’—‘the great law of love’—‘the very perfection of criminal jurisprudence’—‘a well-spring of truth, the stream that gushes up from which is pure benevolence, as clear as crystal.’ This passage is the chief ground on which the defenders of capital punishment rest their belief; and we propose to examine it somewhat minutely.

But we must first inquire, whether our opponents mean to read the passage literally, or whether they mean to take a little latitude in their application of it. In either case they thrust themselves on the horn of a fatal dilemma. If they take the passage literally, then it proves too much (as we shall shortly show); and if they allow themselves a latitude in its application, then they are forced to concede a latitude to us likewise, and cannot hold us bound by their conclusions.

We will suppose that the words are read literally. Let us see what they amount to. Dr. Cheever says, that they are characterized by ‘a wonderful explicitness and compactness;’ so we cannot well make an error in applying them. ‘Whoso sheddeth man’s blood, by man shall his blood be shed;’—this is the passage.

*'Whoso.'* This includes everybody. There is no exception in favour of any one. It refers, therefore, to kings as well as to subjects, to magistrates as well as to individuals.

*'Sheddeth man's blood.'* Not *'killeth man'*, but *'sheddeth man's blood.'* If a man kill another by strangulation, then, and *sheds no blood*, he evidently is not included in the denunciation; whilst, on the other hand, he who *'sheddeth man's blood,' whether he kill him or not*, is inculpated. Surgeons, consequently, soldiers, Jack Ketches, simple manslayers, stabbers, and all homicides who shed blood, are the persons who alone are referred to. The beast, too, that sheds man's blood, is also included in the sentence. As to murder, there is no especial mention of that at all—the reference is to simple blood-shedding of any sort, to any extent, and with whatever purpose.

*'By man shall his blood be shed.'* *'Shall'* his blood be shed. This may have two meanings, either of which would be strictly grammatical:—first, That man is *hereby endowed with authority* to shed blood; second, That, in the course of things, *it shall so come to pass* that man shall shed the blood of the blood-shedder. Neither of these readings can be established absolutely, therefore either may be selected as correct.

The literal meaning of the words before us is this, then: *Whatsoever (whether man or beast) sheddeth man's blood, for any purpose, or to any extent, with good motive or with evil, shall have his blood shed* (not—*'shall be killed'*), *in the course of God's providence, by his fellow-man.* This is the literal rendering of the passage; and now we ask any man of candour and fairness, whether it is anything like an equivalent for the doctrine that man has built upon it—viz., *Whoso with wicked motive killeth a man, shall be killed, with God's sanction, by the hand of a hired executioner?* For in the text before us, neither *motive* nor *death*, nor God's approval, are at all referred to.

It must seem pretty evident, we think, by this time, that an absolutely literal application of this passage is quite out of the question; and this brings us to remark upon the other horn of the dilemma. Upon this the advocate of capital punishment *must fall.*

He will say, I never meant to maintain that the words must be taken *quite* literally; they must be construed inferentially; and straightway he gives you his own inferences as absolute foundations. But it is clear that this is a virtual surrender of the whole argument. If he may interpret the words according to *his* views, we may construe them in such a manner as will suit *ours*. When he calls upon us to give him the latitude he claims, we gain a right to demand a similar margin for *ourselves*:

'The mercy we to others show,  
That mercy show to us.'

And thus the question becomes a perfectly open one; and it is as unfair, as it is absurd, to insist upon one man's reading, as a version binding upon all men.

Our argument will now be clear, then. If the passage is read literally it involves principles of action which no one can defend or follow; and if it be an open question, to be settled in each man's mind according to his own idea and comprehension of it, then it cannot be put forth as an absolute, explicit, and fundamental law of God, binding every man through all time to one particular construction of it.

We think that there cannot be a plainer proof of the inherent weakness of our opponent's case, than that they should choose, as the 'corner-stone' (we quote Dr. Cheever,) of their argumental edifice, a passage which, as we have seen, no man can dare to take literally; and which, consequently, is left open to as many constructions as there are minds to construe it. Why, there is no passage in the whole Bible so much disputed, and so differently read, as this. By one writer we are assured that it is a mere prophecy. By another we are told that it is a command. A third calls it 'the Divine institution of civil government.' A fourth conceives that it gives to *any* man the right of being the avenger of blood. A fifth affirms that it reserves the exercise of vengeance to the Almighty, that it refers to the punishment of murder by the providence of God. A sixth says that it refers not to murder at all. A seventh maintains that it pertains not to murder only, but to all homicide, accidental or wilful. Another argues that it is an injunction against cannibalism, and looks upon it as a prohibition of human flesh for food. Another calls it 'a Divine appointment without the Divine approval—affirming that the bloodshedder's blood *shall* be shed, but not that it *ought* to be shed.' Another affirms that it is the first assertion of the great doctrine of the atonement by blood (Dr. Cheever agrees in this). Another views it 'as predictive of an indirect consequence, not injunctive of a direct retribution.' Another sees in it the origin of the doctrine of sacrifice for sin—a doctrine completed when Jesus was sacrificed on Calvary. Another considers it a general injunction against crimes of violence of any sort. Another says it ought to be read '*whatsoever* sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed,' being an injunction including brutes as well as men. Another writes that it refers to those who cause a man to be put to death by false witnesses. Another believes that it is meant to set up every man's brother as the avenger of his blood. Another thinks it an institution peculiar

to the time—‘the passion-language of a barbarous age’—intended to last only until the next manifestation of God to man. Another describes it as ‘a simple denunciation of God’s vengeance against men of blood,’ similar in effect to the threat, that ‘the bloody and deceitful man shall not live out half his days.’ Another reasons, ‘that even granting it to be a prophecy which man is bound to fulfil, the fulfilmer may, notwithstanding be wrong, even as Judas, although obliged to betray, was, nevertheless, punished for betraying.’ And these are but a few of the various readings which this passage has received!

Then comes the question about the translation of the passage into English. The above readings, of course, take the English translation for granted; but our case would be most incomplete, were we not further to remark that even the translation is disputed: that, in fact, scarcely two scholars can be found who agree in their renderings of the verse. It appears that the original may be read in either of these four ways:—1. Whoso sheddeth man’s blood *by* man shall his blood be shed. 2. Whoso sheddeth man’s blood *through* man shall his blood be shed. 3. Whoso sheddeth man’s blood *in* man shall his blood be shed. 4. Whoso sheddeth man’s blood *among* (or *with*) man shall his blood be shed. The translators, of course, give a great variety of readings. The Septuagint renders it, ‘The person shedding the blood of man, for the blood of that man his blood shall be shed.’ Wycliffe reads it, ‘Whoso sheddeth out man’s blood, his blood shall be shed,’ (without reference to man’s agency in the matter). The Chaldee says it refers to the shedding of blood by false witnesses. Luther, Cranmer, Tonstall and Ridley, Coverdale, Matthew Beza, and the bishops, give it as it is commonly received. Calmet translates it, ‘Whoso sheddeth man’s blood shall be punished by the shedding of his own blood.’ The Vulgate and the Spanish version of Scio, omit the words ‘*by man*’ altogether. Ostervald reads it thus—‘Whoso sheddeth man’s blood *that is in him* his blood shall be shed,’ treating the words ‘*that is in him*’ as a mere pleonasm, similar to this—‘Who knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of a man *that is in him?*’ Jerome reads it as Wycliffe does; and Calvin agrees with Luther and the bishops. There are other versions which differ from any of these, but we have quoted enough to serve our purpose.

Here, then, is a passage upon the translation of which from the original no two scholars can agree, and upon the meaning of which, when translated, there are as many opinions as there are commentators. No man can undertake to tell us whether it is an edict or a prediction; whether it refers to the government of God, or of man; whether it pertains to murder, to cannibalism, or

to blood-letting. And now we ask, what man can dare to say, with this contrariety of opinion staring him in the face, that the words form a clear and indisputable command from God to man, to punish the crime of murder with death by the hands of the executioner?

But weak as we thus find the ground of the capital punishment supporter to be, it becomes even weaker when we try it by the *practice* of the ancient world. If the law requiring the infliction of death for murder had been as plain, explicit, and unmistakeable, as our opponents aver, we should surely find some examples of its enforcement in the Book where the enactment stands recorded. Not one, however, can be discovered, whilst we read of many wherein the practice was clearly *not* enforced. Several cases of murder are related, but in no instance is the penalty of death for the crime inflicted, or even mentioned; which seems unaccountably strange if the law existed. We may name, amongst others, the slaughter of the Shechemites by the sons of Jacob, the murder of the Egyptian by Moses, the killing of Jael by Sisera, the treacherous destruction of Uriah by David, and the shedding of innocent blood by Manasseh. In all these cases there is the ‘shedding of man’s blood,’ but in none of them is ‘man’s blood shed’ in return. Thus, at the time when it is contended that the law was newly promulgated, and therefore most rigid in its requirements, there was evidently no such practice in existence.

There are two other cases of murder recorded in the early Scripture, which materially strengthen our position. The cases are those of Cain and Lamech.

Cain was the first murderer, and therefore the worst. One naturally supposes, then, that had the Almighty intended to have established, once and for ever, the principle of ‘blood for blood,’ he would have done so here. The first murderer should have been the first example. But God visited him with quite another kind of penalty. He preserved him from destruction: he made it a crime to kill him: and he branded him, that men might know him for a murderer, and be deterred by his example from his crime.

Lamech also committed murder;—or, if not murder, it was at least wilful bloodshedding, and therefore liable to the penalty; but so far from his being destroyed, we find him referring to the example of Cain, and saying, that should he be killed for his crime, he should be avenged, not seven, but seventy-fold. Every illustration, then, as well as every rational argument, tends to show that the passage under consideration should not be, and never was, looked upon as a Divine command to man.

But even if it ever were, there is no reason whatever to conclude that at this great distance of time from its promulgation, the world is still to be held bound by it. It was not the *earliest* legislation of God on the subject of murder, for Cain's instance, and Lamech's also, occurred before it. Nor is it a *final* law upon the matter, for there is a far more complete and compact piece of legislation thereon in the Jewish code. It is neither the beginning nor the completion of law ; but stands, a solitary declaration, opposed alike to what goes before it, and to what comes after it. It is surely a fair presumption, that when the Almighty legislates anew on a subject, his primary law is repealed and superseded. It is manifestly so in the case before us, for the law given to Moses is totally different from the words spoken to Noah, and the observance of the latter is incompatible with the observance of the former. The one includes all homicide—the other makes distinctions in the crime. Moses *must* have regarded the Noachic precept as a dead letter ; and if it became a dead letter to Moses, there can be no reason to suppose that it was intended to remain a living law to the rest of the world. But even if it be argued that the Jewish law was given to the Jews alone, and therefore the general precept given to Noah remained unrepealed, then we find its abrogation in the law which confessedly binds all the earth—the Decalogue.

The changed condition of the human family as time advanced, would of itself have necessitated a change in the principle of law. The enactment suitable to utter barbarians would become useless, if not injurious, in a more civilized condition of the world. Even Dr. Cheever is forced to admit that this 'Noachic law' was 'in many respects a dangerous institution.' It was so wide, that it included *all* homicide, and made even beasts responsible for the shedding of human blood. One can well suppose that the smallness of the human family at the time of the promulgation of the precept, rendered an extraordinary care of human life necessary, and thus made even *accidental* homicide a punishable offence. But in the Mosaic economy there is an evident design—the stringency of the former period having passed away—to distinguish between accident and intention, between homicide with hatred, and simple manslaughter. It draws a line between the two crimes, and awards different penalties to each. All this goes clearly to show that the Noachic law (whatever it was) clashed with the next divine revelation, and became superseded when the fuller code was given to Moses, and so ended for ever when the Mosaic commenced.

In any case, then, this passage cannot be binding upon *us*.

If it is a LAW, it has since been superseded by a later law on the same subject, from the hands of the same legislator ; if it is a mere DENUNCIATION of God's vengeance in the course of his providence against the murderer, then, of course, it is no warrant to us, and we may safely leave the fulfilment of the awful prediction to Him who says, '*The bloody and deceitful man shall not live out half his days.*'

That the Jewish law, upon this or upon any other subject, is binding upon the Christian world, none, we suppose, but our Hebrew brethren, will maintain. The church of England gives it up, in fact ; for in her seventh article she says, that the law of Moses 'does not bind Christian men, nor ought of necessity to be received in any commonwealth ;' and no sect of Christians, heretics, or infidels, can be found who recognize it as a rule of life. It is true that Mr. Tayler Lewis regards the spirit of the Jewish *lex talionis* as being 'of the very essence of right and natural justice,' but even he does not insist on its observance now. He appeals, in fact, to other rules ; as, indeed, he finds himself compelled.

We shall not dwell long, then, upon this portion of the subject, for there is no need to do so. It will be sufficient to remark, that the Mosaic law was given at a particular time, and for a particular object, which object has since been accomplished ; and that it has been entirely annulled by the development of the Christian scheme.

There is an evident purpose in both the Noachic and Jewish ordinances. They both were founded upon the idea of sacrifice for sin—expiation. Adam had fallen, and the world's redemption had to be accomplished in Christ. To bring about that end, and to point to it continuously and significantly, was the evident aim of the early institutions of God's ordering. By the blood of Christ the world was to be purified ; and, therefore, blood was made sacred from the first. To Cain, the first words were, 'Thy brother's *blood* crieth to me from the ground.' To Noah, the injunction is, 'Flesh with the *blood* thereof, shall ye not eat ;' and the words, 'Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed,' are, to our mind, only a link in the same great argument. In the Mosaic law this idea is promulgated with even greater force. Many passages may be selected therefrom in proof, but the following will suffice :—

'What man soever there be of the house of Israel that killeth an ox, or lamb, or goat, in the camp, or that killeth it out of the camp ; and bringeth it not unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, to offer an offering unto the Lord, before the tabernacle of the Lord, *blood* shall be imputed unto that man : he hath shed blood, and that man shall be cut off from among his people.'—Lev. xvii. 3, 4.

'And whatsoever man there be of the house of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among you, that eateth any manner of *blood*, I will even set my face against that soul that eateth blood, and will cut him off from among his people.'—ib. xvii. 10.

'The land cannot be cleansed of the *blood* that is shed therein but by the blood of him that shed it.'

'The life of all flesh is in the *blood* thereof. Whosoever eateth it shall be cut off.'—ib. xvii. 14.

'For the life of the flesh is in the *blood*, and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul.'—ib. xvii. 11.

'The *blood* of the covenant.'—Exod. xxiv. 7, 8.

We see by this that there was a purpose in view in making blood sacred. The whole system of sacrifice (from Noah downwards) was to typify the one sacrifice appointed to take place on Calvary. This will be sufficient to explain the precept to Noah and the laws to Moses.

But when the purpose was accomplished, of course the system ceased. The one sacrifice once offered, expiation, or sacrifice for sin, was no longer to be the principle of punishment. Christ's blood was shed that man's *might no more be shed*. God is represented as saying, that in burnt offerings and *sacrifices for sin* he had no pleasure any more. All prior revelations merged into that greater one which Christ announced. The stars of truth which had been shining through the night and early dawn of time, were at length eclipsed by the rising of the Sun of Righteousness. Man was no longer to be under the 'covenant of law,' but under the 'New Testament' of grace. Dr. Cheever allows us for once to agree with him most cordially when he says, that the object of the Christian dispensation was 'to regard law as subjectively reigning in the human soul, rather than existing in relation to the outward ideas of law and penalty.' The sword of justice which had smitten the man who was God's fellow was then sheathed. The idea of the sacrifice of blood for sin passed away for ever on Calvary: Christ was truly 'the end of the law.'

There is no authority, then, to kill the murderer transmitted to man by the law of Moses. When the vail of the temple was rent in twain, the whole system was declared to be 'finished.' Its end was accomplished, and its requirements ceased. In the new revelation all others merged. 'God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake to us by the prophets, hath in these latter days spoken to us by his Son.'

There is no necessity for any lengthened argument to show that in the Christian scheme the punishment of death is not commanded, for none of our opponents affirm the reverse even

in their wildest assertions. They state frequently enough, that the Noachic and Mosaic laws are corroborated in the New Testament, but they never venture to say that if the Noachic and Mosaic ordinances were entirely put out of the question (as we think we have shewn that they must be), the New Testament would alone sustain their conclusion. Our remarks on this head will therefore be extremely brief.

The New Testament is a message from God to men, to the effect that sin has been atoned for; that grace, not expiation, is to be the principle of judgment henceforth; that the Almighty has now condescended to redeem, pardon and restore even the vilest sinner. Stripe for stripe, evil for evil, an eye for an eye, are forbidden. Inward motive, not outward act, is proclaimed to be the real measure of sin; and inward penalties, not outward inflictions, are to be the punishments enforced. ‘The Son of Man came not to destroy men’s lives, but to save them.’ He ‘abolished death.’ The days were come when he was to make a new covenant with man. ‘He came and preached peace.’ He made us free from the law of sin and death. He bids us disregard the Mosaic system of retaliation, and avenge not ourselves. He sets us an example of the doctrines he came to teach, by praying for his murderers. He tells us to ‘fear not them who kill the body;’ he teaches us to expect forgiveness of our trespasses only ‘*as we forgive them that trespass against us.*’ He bids us ‘judge not, that we be not judged;’ and says, that ‘with what measure we mete it shall be measured to us again.’ He points out to us the surpassing value of the human soul, and continually teaches us to beware of jeopardising it. He urges that life is a period of probation, and that ‘as the tree falleth so it must lie.’ He supplants the principle of fear by that of love. He requires ‘mercy, not sacrifice.’ He came upon earth ‘not to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved;’ ‘he is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance.’ We learn from him, that there is mercy even for the worst, and that ‘there is joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth.’ He heralds the period of perfection. ‘The law made nothing perfect, but his bringing in of a better hope *did.*’ Man was till His advent lying under the old law of death, but Christ was ‘the resurrection and the *life.*’ He brought life and immortality to light by the gospel; he abrogated ‘the letter that killeth,’ and brought us under the dominion of the ‘Spirit that giveth life.’

We would thus sum up our observations upon the religious aspect of this question. The Almighty unquestionably approved and commanded the infliction of death in the early ages of the world, but only when he himself directly controlled

it, and when there could be no chance of error in its enforcement. He makes it to be seen, moreover, that although for a great purpose of his own he ordained the system of sacrifice, to which the punishment of death pertained, he parts not with his high prerogative of life and death, but still remains 'God the Lord to whom belong the issues of life.' 'I kill and I make alive,' He says—'To me belongeth vengeance and recompense.' And when he leaves us without any peculiar enactment on the subject, he presents to us his universal and eternal law—**Thou Shalt Not Kill.**

Thus, then, we have disposed of the objections which it is imagined that morality and religion present to the treatment of this question as one entirely of human policy: and are free to try it by the only direct test in our power—the test of experience.

We propose to enter fully into that portion of the subject in a future number; and to prove, by plain and indisputable facts, that the world has now arrived at that era in its history when the penalty of death not only fails to prevent crime, but actually incites to its commission.

---

ART. II.—*The Princess.—A Medley.* By Alfred Tennyson. London: E. Moxon.

THE announcement of a new volume from the pen of so gifted a writer as Mr. Tennyson, could not but be welcome, and we therefore eagerly awaited the appearance of his 'Princess,' although the second title rather puzzled us. As the muse he invokes is not of the order 'to amble at court,' we felt well assured that his 'Princess' would have no relation to any of the royal families of Europe. We, consequently, hoped, indeed expected, to receive some wild and stirring tale of the old heroic time, or, more likely still—remembering how sweetly and gracefully he has sung the fairy tale of the 'Sleeping Beauty,'—some story, wondrous, but poetical withal, though perhaps as fragmentary as that which Chaucer told of *his* princess—

' Who owned the virtuous ring and glass.'

Still, the second title seemed to forbid this expectation; but until we took up the little book before us, we had no idea of

meeting with anything so *bizarre*, indeed grotesque, as this correctly enough named 'medley,' in which grave matter of fact and wild fancies, solemn disquisitions, and sportive ridicule, all mingled with much sweet poetry, are so strangely jumbled together.

'The Princess' is prefaced by a poetical prologue, which, as one of our contemporaries has justly remarked, 'is in reality an apologetic supplement,' and from this we learn, that the writer, enjoying the hospitalities of Sir Walter Vivian, who—

' All a summer's day,  
Gave his broad lawns until the set of sun  
Up to the people'—

and having adjourned with his friends to some neighbouring ruins, he, in the interval of conversation, reads from a family chronicle :—

' Of old Sir Ralph a page or two that rang  
With tilt and tourney; then the tale of her  
That drove her foes with slaughter from her walls,  
And much I praised her nobleness, and 'Where,'  
Ask'd Walter, 'lives there such a woman now?'

Quick answered Lilia, 'There are thousands now  
Such women, but convention beats them down:  
It is but bringing up; no more than that:  
You men have done it: how I hate you all!  
O were I some great Princess, I would build  
Far off from men a college of my own,  
And I would teach them all things: you should see.'

And one said, smiling, 'Pretty were the sight  
If our old halls could change their sex, and flaunt  
With prudes for proctors, dowagers for deans,  
And sweet girl-graduates in their golden hair.'—p. 6.

Upon this theme, therefore, a smart dialogue ensues, which ends by his being required to tell—

' A tale for summer as befits the time.'

It is, however, also stipulated that it shall be of a prince and princess, and that he shall be the hero. To this our author assents, and therefore begins :—

' A prince I was, blue-eyed, and fair in face,  
With lengths of yellow ringlet, like a girl,  
For on my cradle shone the northern star.

At a very early age he was betrothed to a princess, whom, though he had never seen, he falls in love with from hearsay, and wears her picture, and 'one dark tress' of her hair,—

' And all around them both,  
Sweet thoughts would swarm as bees about their queen.'

When the time draws near for their bridal, the king sends an embassy which returns with the news, that the princess had retired from court, and would not fulfil the contract. The prince, determined to see, at least, this obdurate beauty, endeavours to prevail on his father, to allow him to set forth with two companions to the court of the lady's father. This the old king refuses, but the prince, impatient to see his lady-love, steals away with two friends, and hastens to the court of King Gama. This king, 'a little, dry old man,' receives him cordially, but informs him that his daughter, led astray by 'two widows, Lady Psyche and Lady Blanche,' and their theories, had fled from the court, 'all wild to found an university,' which she has done, and prohibited men on pain of death from entering. This account only stimulates the curiosity of the prince, who, remembering that 'in masque and pageant' he and his friends had often assumed a female dress, determines to do so now, and nothing fearing that their disguise will be discovered, they press onward until they arrive at this college for women; though whether situated in Europe, America—or from the names, Gama and Arac, of the king and his son,—somewhere in Africa, Mr. Tennyson, unfortunately, has not told us.

' There stood a bust of Pallas for a sign,  
By two sphere lamps blazoned like Heaven and Earth  
With constellation and with continent,  
Above an archway : riding in, we called ;  
A plump-armed Ostleress and a stable wench  
Came running at the call, and helped us down.  
Then stept a buxom hostess forth, and sailed  
Full-blown before us into rooms which gave  
Upon a pillared porch, the bases lost  
In laurel : her we asked of that and this,  
And who were tutors. 'Lady Blanche' she said,  
' And Lady Psyche.' 'Which was prettiest,  
Best natured?' 'Lady Psyche.' 'Her pupils we,'  
One voice, we cried ; and I sat down and wrote,  
In such a hand as when a field of corn  
Bows all its ears before the roaring East ;

' Three ladies of the Northern empire pray  
Your Highness would enrol them with your own,  
As Lady Psyche's pupils.

This I sealed,  
 (A Cupid reading) to be sent with dawn ;  
 And then to bed, where half in doze I seemed  
 To float about a glimmering night, and watch  
 A full sea glazed with muffled moonlight, swell  
 On some dark shore just seen that it was rich.'—p. 22.

In the morning the three gentlemen clothed in very becoming 'academic silks,' are introduced to the princess,—

‘——— Liker to the inhabitant  
 Of some clear planet close upon the sun,  
 Than our man's earth,—’

who gives them a gracious welcome, and pointing to the statues of the heroines of ancient times, bids them take these for their models. They then go to the lecture-room, where the Lady Psyche, the pretty young widow, gives an address, which not only charms her pupils, but steals the heart of the prince's companion, Cyril. Unfortunately, the other companion, Florian, discovers his sister in the fair lecturer, and the result is, that their disguise is detected by Psyche, and more than half suspected by Melissa, a pretty little blue, whose respect for her mother, the other professor, rather than any love for learning, has led thither. They next go to dinner,—

‘ And in we streamed  
 Among the columns, pacing staid and still  
 By twos and threes, till all from end to end  
 With beauties every shade of brown and fair,  
 In colours gayer than the morning mist,  
 The long hall glittered like a bed of flowers.  
 How might a man not wander from his wits  
 Pierced through with eyes, but that I kept mine own  
 Intent upon the princess, where she sat  
 Among her grave professors, scattering gems  
 Of art and science :—

\* \* \* \* \*

At last a solemn grace  
 Concluded, and we sought the gardens : there  
 One walked reciting by herself, and one  
 In this hand held a volume as to read,  
 And smoothed a petted peacock down with that :  
 Some to a low song oared a shallop by,  
 Or under arches of the marble bridge  
 Hung, shadowed from the heat : some hid and sought  
 In the orange thickets : others tost a ball  
 Above the fountain-jets, and back again  
 With laughter.’—p. 44.

But, pleasing and graceful as these and such like descriptions are, they, after all, only give us the notion of a huge 'finishing school,' for tall young ladies; and we almost feel, with the Lady Blanche, that the gentlemen have no business there.

'Morn, in the white wake of the morning star,  
Came furrowing all the orient into gold,—'

when Melissa meets the three intruders, and tells them that her mother, a very duenna, has also detected their disguise; and she counsels flight. The young men, however, think they may as well stay a little longer, while the prince bursts out into the fine apostrophe:—

"The crane,' I said, 'may chatter of the crane,  
The dove may murmur of the dove, but I,  
An eagle, clang an eagle to the sphere.  
My princess, O my princess! true she errs;  
For being, and wise in knowing that she is,  
Three times more noble than threescore of men,  
She sees herself in every woman else,  
And so she wears her error like a crown  
To blind the truth and me.' —p. 51.

The princess, meanwhile, unaware of treason in the camp, summons them, with some others, to ride out with her.

'Agreed to, this, the day fled on through all  
Its range of duties to the appointed hour.  
Then summoned to the porch we went. She stood  
Among her maidens, higher by the head,  
Her back against a pillar, her foot on one  
Of those tame leopards. Kitten-like he rolled  
And pawed about her sandals. I drew near:  
My heart beat thick with passion and with awe,  
And from my breast the involuntary sigh,  
Brake, as she smote me with the light of eyes  
That lent my knee desire to kneel, and shook  
My pulses, till to horse we clomb, and so  
Went forth in long retinue following up  
The river as it narrowed to the hills.' —p. 55.

During the ride, there is a great deal of talk between the prince and princess; and they then sit down to a collation, which a maiden—enlivens, we cannot say, by a rather lugubrious song. The prince is next called upon, and he 'aggravates' his voice 'like any nightingale,' and sings some very moving stanzas addressed to the swallow, but which rouse the scorn of the princess, as 'a mere love poem.' Meanwhile, Cyril, who has been paying unremitting attention to the wine-

flask, bursts out with ‘a careless tavern-catch, unmeet for ladies,’ to the utter alarm, as we may well suppose, of the fair company. The prince, equally forgetful of his disguise, ‘smote him on the breast’ with right masculine force, and all is confusion. The princess bids her ladies fly; and, flying too precipitately herself, falls into the river, from which, according to the rule, she is snatched by the prince, who consigns her to her maidens, and makes off.

With strange temerity, he returns to the gardens, where he is seized, and led before the princess once more. Here all is confusion; the Lady Psyche has fled, leaving her infant daughter behind her; Melissa is in deep disgrace, and her mother prophesying the overthrow of the whole establishment, when ‘a woman-post’ comes in, bearing letters, from which it appears that Princess Ida’s father is captive to his brother king, who, alarmed at the unexpected absence of his son, thinks that he has been taken some advantage of. The letters announcing this intelligence are flung by Ida to the prince; his answer is ‘eloquent music’ :—

‘O not to pry and peer on your reserve,  
But led by golden wishes and a hope,  
The child of regal compact, did I break  
Your precinct; not a scorner of your sex  
But venerator, and willing it should be  
All that it might be; hear me, for I bear,  
Though man, yet human, whatsoe’er your wrongs,  
From the flaxen curl to the gray lock a life  
Less mine than yours: my nurse would tell me of you;  
I babbled for you, as babies for the moon,  
Vague brightness; when a boy, you stooped to me  
From all high places, lived in all fair lights,  
Came in long breezes wrapt from the inmost south  
And blown to the inmost north; at eve and dawn  
With Ida, Ida, Ida, rang the woods;  
The leader wild-swan in among the stars  
Would clang it, and lapt in wreaths of glow-worm light  
The mellow breaker murmured Ida. Now,  
Because I would have reached you, though you had been  
Sphered up with Cassiopëia, or the enthroned  
Persephone in Hades, now at length,  
Those winters of abeyance all worn out,  
A man I came to see you: but, indeed,  
Not in this frequence can I lend full tongue,  
O noble Ida, to those thoughts that wait  
On you, their centre.’—p. 85.

His pleadings are vain, he is scornfully dismissed, and he seeks his father’s camp, outside the walls.

Up to this part of the 'medley' we are evidently contemplating the doings of people belonging to the nineteenth century. As we have before remarked, the college is exceedingly like a large ladies' boarding-school, and, we may add, that the princess talks very much like a lady enamoured of literary and scientific institutes. But, 'a change comes o'er the spirit' of the tale, and, now, we are in the midst of men in armour, and kings heading their own armies, and kings' sons offering challenges to single combat. It is, at length, agreed that Ida's three brothers shall fight the three intruders. The lists are prepared in chivalrous fashion, lances are set in rest, then good swords brandished, and, at last,—

‘Life and love  
Flowed from me; darkness closed me, and I fell.’

With the conquest of the prince by Ida's tall brother her conquest begins. The sight of the wounded men, and of the prince who so lately rescued her, moves her pity, and after much recrimination with his father and the Lady Blanche, she bids her doors to be thrown open for all the wounded, taking the prince under her especial care:—

‘So was their sanctuary violated,  
So their fair college turned to hospital;  
At first with all confusion: by-and bye  
Sweet order lived again with other laws:  
A kindlier influence reigned; and everywhere  
Low voices with the ministering hand  
Hung round the sick: the maidens came, they talked,  
They sang, they read: till she not fair, began  
To gather light, and she that was, became  
Her former beauty treble; and to and fro  
With books, with flowers, with angel offices,  
Like creatures native unto gracious act,  
And in their own clear element, they moved.’—p. 142.

‘But sadness on the soul of Ida fell,’—.

while she sat watching the prince through the changes of his slow recovery. This is very gracefully told; and her mingled regrets at the failure of her cherished plan, draw from the prince these fine remarks, which seem to us to be the moral Mr. Tennyson intends to draw from the whole:—

‘‘Blame not thyself too much,’ I said, ‘nor blame  
Too much the sons of men and barbarous laws;  
These were the rough ways of the world till now,  
Henceforth thou hast a helper, me, that know

The woman's cause is man's: they rise or sink  
 Together, dwarfed or godlike, bond or free;  
 For she that out of Lethe scales with man  
 The shining steps of Nature, shares with man  
 His nights, his days, moves with him to one goal,  
 Stays all the fair young planet in her hands—  
 If she be small, slight natured, miserable,  
 How shall men grow? We two will serve them both  
 In aiding her, strip off, as in us lies,  
 (Our place is much) the parasitic forms  
 That seem to keep her up but drag her down—  
 Will leave her field to burgeon and to bloom  
 From all within her, make herself her own  
 To give or keep, to live and learn and be  
 All that not harms distinctive womanhood.  
 For woman is not undeveloped man  
 But diverse: could we make her as the man,  
 Sweet love were slain, whose dearest bond is this  
 Not like to like, but like in difference:  
 Yet in the long years liker must they grow;  
 The man be more of woman, she of man;  
 He gain in sweetness and in moral height,  
 Nor lose the wrestling thews that throw the world;  
 She mental breadth, nor fail in childward care;  
 More as the double-natured poet each:  
 Till at the last she set herself to man,  
 Like perfect music unto noble words;  
 And so these twain upon the skirts of time,  
 Sit side by side, full summed in all their powers,  
 Dispensing harvest, sowing the to-be,  
 Self-reverent each and reverencing each,  
 Distinct in individualities.'—pp. 155, 156.

The reader will readily conclude that Ida is won by such eloquent pleading, and thus 'The Princess' ends.

From the foregoing specimens it will be seen that the work before us, like all that Mr. Tennyson has written, is characterized by much fine poetry; but that it is also (and this is his prevailing fault) distinguished by want of unity of design and by inequality of construction. Foundation and superstructure, precious as may be many of the materials, are yet mingled with much which should have had no place there; and the whole, consequently, rather resembles grotto-work, where the spar glitters beside the common pebble stone, and the agate and jasper are embedded in sand,—than the stately building, perfect in design, which our great poets have delighted to construct. We are half inclined to believe that Mr. Tennyson has seen his mistake, and hence his second title; we shall therefore hope soon

to receive another poem, whether of princess or queen, full of as much sweet and noble poetry, but more systematic.

As a sign of the times, the work before us offers much for reflection. To the reader acquainted with the numerous 'Battles of the Sexes,' which, from the time of the *jeu d'esprit* in the 'Spectator,' formed so favourite a subject for verse and prose with the writers of the last century, the contrast afforded by this volume is great indeed. We have often smiled when reading those one-sided vindications of 'the right divine' of man; and scarcely wondered at the energetic denunciations of poor Mary Wolstoncraft against such contemners of womanhood; but here we have one of our most delightful poets, though commencing half in *bardinage*, warming as he dwells upon *her* cherished subject, 'the rights of women,' and pleading those rights with a force and an eloquence which the world has scarcely witnessed before.

---

ART. III.—*The Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels.* By Andrews Norton, late Professor of Sacred History. Harwood University. Two vols. Second Edition. London: J. Chapman. 1847.

It may excite surprise that, in the present day, there should be occasion to discuss so elementary a question as that to which these volumes are devoted. After the laborious researches of Lardner and Jones, and the lucid condensation of Paley, it might naturally be supposed, that if anything in literary history be settled, it is that the gospels of the New Testament were written by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, and that these narratives have been transmitted from age to age in their essential integrity. It almost looks like an offence to the understanding of an English Christian, no less than an outrage on his religious convictions, to place these tried documents of his faith in a light which seems to admit the possibility of their being anything less than that which the Christian church in all ages has held them to be—the true histories of inspired apostles and evangelists. We own to a large participation in feelings of this kind. Such questions, after all the evidence which has been accumulated in opposition to the denials of unbelief, and the morbid incoherences of scepticism, come upon us with somewhat like disgust. It is one of the penalties, we sup-

pose, that must be paid for whatever advantages we derive from continental scholarship, to be infested with the crudities of English infidels, hashed up by the diligence and ingenuity of theological professors, long after they had been consigned to oblivion by the good sense and religious taste of our own community. We remember people, some years ago, being frequently annoyed by sailor-looking men, with ear-rings and glazed hats, and a well feigned naval air about their dress and manner; who came to the door, offering, very privately, to dispose of real Bandana silk handkerchiefs, which were wrapped up in strange Indian-looking coverings. It turned out that these tempting articles were manufactured in England, that they were inferior to goods intended for the English market, and that, after being exported to Germany, they had been *brought back*. These pretended smugglers were not unlike some importers of other articles from Germany, which turn out to be of home production.

Let us give one or two examples of our meaning.

Hobbes, in his '*Leviathan*,' while acknowledging the antiquity of the gospels, and the probability that they contain faithful registers of actual events, imagined that there were but few copies of them in the second and third centuries, that those few were in the hands of ecclesiastical persons, and that it was not until the council of Laodicea, in the fourth century, that they were received as of Divine authority in the Christian church. Leland, in his '*Amyntor*,' published a catalogue of spurious writings ascribed to Jesus Christ and his apostles, which he represents as having been at first of equal authority with the gospels, and which were not generally distinguished from them before the latter times of Trajan or Adrian.

Lord Bolingbroke, in his '*Letters on History*,' asks—'if the fathers of the first century do mention some passages that are agreeable to what we read in our evangelists, will it follow that these fathers had the same gospels before them? To say so, is a manifest abuse of history, and quite inexcusable in writers that knew, or ought to have known, that these fathers made use of other gospels, wherein such passages might be contained; or they might be preserved in unwritten tradition. Besides which, I could almost venture to affirm, that these fathers of the first century do not expressly name the gospels we have of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John.' This mode of attacking the gospels by our English infidels, has been taken up by professed Christian theologians in Germany, and smuggled, we might almost say, into our country as the genuine fruit of German research and scholarship. Assuming, with our English infidels, that the gospels are not the productions of the writers to

whom they are ascribed, these learned gentlemen have set up ingenious but most superficial modes of accounting for the unquestionable fact, that in the latter part of the second century they were received as genuine by all the Christian churches then existing in various quarters of the world. We have confessed our strong dislike to all this. We are not careful to conceal it.—It may be asked, indeed, Do you not allow freedom of investigation? Would you put down the expression of opinion?—Most certainly we both claim and yield freedom of investigation on all subjects. We have no wish that any men should be forcibly prevented from saying or writing what they believe to be true, or exposing what they believe to be false, or even doubtful, in that which is held for truth by others. At the same time, when we see the acknowledged teachers of Christianity prominent, eager, ingenious, and persevering in obtruding on men their ill-concealed infidelity, and using their position in society to weaken the historical foundations on which the whole Christian system rests; we do not feel that we are chargeable with illiberality in denouncing such performances as mischievous, and their writers as either feeble or dishonest usurpers of a function for which, whatever be their learning, they lack the most essential qualifications. While investigation must be left free, we cannot forget that such investigations often betray dispositions which are very remote from the love of truth, or reverence for religion. We know of no reason why men are to gratify their vanity, their fondness for novelty, their ill-regulated love of hypothesis and conjecture, at the expense of disturbing the faith of Christians, and affording excuses to the profane and thoughtless, for regarding all religion as uncertain in its evidence, and, therefore, entirely without authority.—It may be quite true, as happily it is, that these semi-infidel publications call forth the counter-publications of better scholars and sounder reasoners, and that the usual result is a more intelligent and a stronger grasp, on the part of Christians, of the historical truth, the literary integrity, and the Divine inspiration of their sacred books. But this result, gained in spite of the writers to whom we refer, abates not a jot of the impertinence and shallowness and wretched inconsistencies which they palm upon the world as theological discoveries, and which are too eagerly caught at here, as undoubtedly valuable, just because they come from some foreign university. We think it peculiarly unfortunate that Bishop Marsh, who took the lead in bringing the German theologians of the last century before the English public, should have so thoroughly imbibed some of the worst features of their fundamental scepticism, doing more injury to the general interests of practical Christianity than all the criticism and inter-

pretation of the last half-century have done good. That many theologians, from Semler downwards, have rendered great service to the Christian church by their critical and philological works, we are not denying; but, while they have been elucidating the language of the Scriptures, not a few of them have done much, by their conjectures and speculations, to undermine the authority of the very books they have explained.

The views which give importance to our sacred writings in the minds of Christian people, are of another order than those which are interesting only to scholars and professional theologians. If the gospels were not revered as the word of God, they would possess but little charm for the bulk even of those by whom they have long been prized as the most precious treasures. The aids afforded by large acquaintance with ancient manuscripts, by the improvements in lexicons and grammars, or by the illustrations of ancient usages, ought not to be, and are not, lightly esteemed, generally, by the Christian people; but then the reason why they care in any measure for these things, is found in their strong belief of the inspired authority of the writings which these lights elucidate. It is their belief that the narratives of the gospel history are true; that they contain the testimony of witnesses; that these witnesses were divinely appointed for this purpose; and that they were fitted for the work to which they were appointed, by the special gifts of the Holy Spirit. Now take away this belief, or produce the impression that it is not well-founded, and Christianity will soon lose its hold on the popular mind, especially on that increasing proportion of our people who are too enlightened for superstition, and too much in love with mental freedom, to take their religion on the authority of man. But the writers whom we have now in view, appear to have no kind of regard for the gospels which we hold to be inspired, that they have not, in an equal degree, for any other ancient writings. They place the life of Jesus on a level with the life of Socrates; and would have the evangelists stand side by side with Xenophon or Plutarch. Reversing the complaint of Balak, we can suppose plain Christians saying to such men,—‘ You came to us with offers of friendship and assistance, professing to enlarge our knowledge of our religion, and to increase our interest in it; but you have deceived us. Whether, at the same time, you have been deceiving yourselves or not, may be a grave question for *you*; for us, it is enough to know that you have been labouring to prove that our religion is not founded in historical truth, or that if it be, there is now no evidence, and, for aught we can see, there never has been satisfactory evidence of this. If the case be as you represent it, our interest in the books on which you are wasting your superfluous

diligence is gone : your labours are nothing to us ; we make no account of your scholarship. But, if the case is not as you say, give us leave to rebuke your presumption and impiety ; not indeed without humility and charity ; yet with the honesty and earnestness of men who know what they believe, and who believe what they profess.' And we think that all Christians are entitled to say this to any man, be his position or his learning what it may, who treats the gospels as being anything less, or anything else, than that which they have been held to be, for seventeen hundred years.

Among the speculations which we feel ourselves warranted, and called on, most emphatically to condemn, is that which gave rise to professor Norton's dissertation now before us. Johann Gottfried Eichorn has been long known and highly esteemed, in Germany, as one of the most eminent orientalists and biblical critics of that country. He was born in 1752, at Dorinzim-mern, in the principality of Hohenloe Ohringen. After being rector of the school at Ohrdruf in the duchy of Gotha, he was appointed, in his twenty-third year, to a chair in the University of Jena, whence he proceeded, three years after, to Göttingen, as professor of biblical and oriental literature.

The first specimen of his oriental learning was given in his '*History of Eastern Affairs before Mohammed*', which was immediately followed by a survey of the oldest monuments of Arabian history. At Göttingen, he devoted himself especially to the criticism of the biblical writings. The fruits of these investigations were his : *Repertorium of Biblical and Oriental Literature*, in eighteen volumes ; to which was added his *Universal Library of Biblical Literature*, in ten volumes ; Introduction to the New Testament, two volumes ; Introduction to the Apocryphal writings of the Old Testament ; and a Commentary on the Apocalypse of John, in two volumes. His historical works, too, are very numerous. In his Introduction to the New Testament, Eichorn *supposes*, after Hobbes, Toland, and Boling-broke, that the gospels, as we now have them, *were not in use till the end of the second century* ; but that before that time, other decidedly different gospels were in circulation, and used in the instruction of Christians.

These *supposed* gospels had a *supposed* common origin in a written gospel, drawn up, it is *supposed*, for the use of Christian teachers, who, without being witnesses of the life and discourses of Jesus, were employed as assistants to the apostles. The early gospels are *supposed*, again, to have received considerable accessions of false and fabulous narratives. At the end of the second century, it is further *supposed* the church selected those which had the greatest marks of credibility, and were the most

complete for common use. From these suppositions it would follow, that we have now no reason for believing that our gospels are the compositions of witnesses; that we have no proof that they are true; and that we cannot rationally regard them as inspired.

As there is something in these *suppositions* which commends them, it seems, to a considerable number of learned moderns in Germany, (who are servilely followed by many in America), we need not wonder at the totally different sentiments with which the gospels are regarded in their country and in our own. But this complicated hypothesis can be manifestly shown to be opposed to all the conclusions drawn from a consideration of the facts. We undertake to prove that there is no occasion for any one of these suppositions; that they are all unfounded; that they have no bearing upon the true question; and that they leave the broad evidence of the Divine authority of the gospels unshaken.

The materials for this proof are so copious and manifold, that our only difficulty lies in making the best selection, and in uniting the perspicuity which is so desirable, with the brevity to which we are restricted. It is obvious to remark, on the threshold, that it is a total misrepresentation of the state of Christians at the close of the second century, to speak of *The Church* as determining, by its own authority, what gospels should be rejected, and what received. There was, then, no organization, no representative body, answering to the notion attached, in later times, to the word Church. The only intelligible sense, therefore, in which this word can be applied to the Christians of that age is, that of the collective churches. But there is no record of any such movement in these churches, as the hypothesis in question supposes.

True it is, the churches of Christ received the gospels. But, in what character did they receive them? There is not a tittle of evidence that they received them as being merely more credible and more complete than writings which were rejected. There is, on the contrary, sufficient historical evidence that they received them as *coming from the inspired writers whose names they bear*. Papias, in the beginning of the second century, affirms, that the gospels of Matthew and Mark were written by Matthew and Mark, and he calls them *oracles*. Near the middle of the same century, Justin Martyr describes these gospels as revered among Christians, equally with the writings of the prophets, and as written by apostles and their companions. Irenæus, contemporary with Justin, says: 'We have not received the knowledge of our salvation by any others than those through whom the gospel has come down to us,

which gospel they preached, and afterwards, by the will of God, transmitted to us in writing, that it might be the foundation and pillar of our faith ;' and he distinctly mentions the four gospels as written by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John.

Clement, of Alexandria, living in the same age, gives an account of the four gospels, as distinguished from all other narratives of the life of Christ, and of the order in which they were composed, according to the testimony of the elders of former times. Now, the value of these testimonies, it should be observed, lies in this—that they do not express merely the judgment of Papias, and Justin, and Irenæus, and Clement, and of other writers who have been frequently quoted to the same effect ; *they embody the testimony of multitudes to a fact well known to Christians in Phrygia, in Gaul, in Palestine, at Carthage, at Alexandria* ; and the fact to which they bear witness is, that the gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, were possessed, revered, and used, as divinely-inspired histories, long before the close of the second century.

Then, on what grounds did the Christians of those widely-separated countries so receive the gospels ? As honest persons, they would not profess their confidence in them, unless they had, or, at least, thought they had, reasons for that confidence. As intelligent persons, well knowing the importance of holding such a belief on sufficient grounds, they could not hold it without much more decided evidence than is allowed for in the mass of suppositions, against which we are reasoning. They were well aware that there were pretended narratives of the life of Jesus. They regarded all mutilating or interpolating of sacred writings with horror. That other narratives were rejected, and that the gospels were copied, translated, inserted in catalogues, read in churches, commented on, and quoted by Christian writers in Asia, Africa, and Europe, at the end of the second century, is acknowledged. But this could not have taken place if these gospels had not existed, *in the form in which they have ever since appeared*, long before, according to the testimony of ancient writers. If the Christians from the first had not known that these gospels were genuine and original histories, how is it to be imagined that they should be unanimously received as such at the close of the second century ? *There was then no authority in the church, but the authority of witnesses.* As Professor Norton has well expressed it :—

' Either the great body of Christians determined to believe what they knew to be false ; or they determined to profess to believe it. The first proposition is an absurdity in terms ; the last is a moral absurdity. There is, then, no ground for the supposition of any interposition of

authority, or of any concert among Christians, at the end of the second century, to select our present gospels for common use; or, in other words, to select from the great number then in existence, four particular manuscripts which should serve as archetypes for all subsequent transcribers, and the text of which should alone be considered as the authorized text. Our present agreement of authorities, which necessarily refers us back to one manuscript of each of the gospels, as the archetype of all the copies of that gospel, cannot thus be explained. We are left, therefore, to the obvious conclusion, which we adopt in regard to other writings, that this manuscript was the original work of an individual author, which has been faithfully transmitted to us.'—vol. i. pp. 27, 28.

The question then is, do the manuscripts agree? We plainly answer, they do. Of course we know that there are slight variations, about which the critics, anxious to magnify an office which is indeed worthy of high honour, have said a great deal that amounts to but very little.

Allowing for all the variations, which are easily accounted for, and by means of which the true text of the gospels has been ascertained more minutely than that of any other ancient writings, all who have gone into such inquiries will allow us to affirm, without hesitation, that the manuscripts must have been copied from one original. We know of nothing in literary criticism which is more clearly proved, or so generally acknowledged, by persons competent to judge in such a case. This agreement, acknowledged to be a fact, cannot be accounted for by any supposed interposition of the authority of the church. For, in the first place, we have no proof that such interposition was at any time required. On the contrary, all the evidence we have goes to show that the gospels were always received by the churches, as standing on a footing totally different from other narratives. Secondly, there is no mention of such interposition, no trace of it, no allusion to it in the early writings. And, thirdly, the very notion of such interposition is utterly at variance with what we know of the constitution, the condition, and the habits of the churches of that early age.

The real historical proof of the genuineness of the gospels is so clear, and so ample, that its very clearness and amplitude prevent our being sensible of the strength of our case.

Professor Norton calculates that, on the lowest computation, there must have been '*three millions of believers* using our present gospels, regarding them with the highest reverence, and anxious to obtain copies of them,' at the end of the second century. He likewise calculates that, among these three millions of Christians, there might not be fewer than sixty thousand copies of the gospels. Now, it must have required a long time before the year A. D. 180, when the authority of the gospels

was so extensively acknowledged, for these books to acquire this sacred reputation. Yet such is the history of these books.

There are many modes of strengthening this general evidence, which cannot be easily explained to persons not conversant with critical studies; and, as we are now writing, not for that class of persons, but for Christians of ordinary intelligence, we abstain from them. There are two or three further considerations, however, which we deem of some importance, and which, we doubt not, will be fully appreciated by all religious men.

The gospels were introduced into the world in a literary age. The Greek language was spoken, and the Greek historians, poets, and philosophers were studied, not at Rome only, but in all the great cities of the empire. Now it was in Rome, at Antioch, at Corinth, Ephesus, Carthage, Alexandria, Lyons, the centres of intellectual power, that the Christian churches were most flourishing, and the gospels most generally used. The persons composing these churches were not what men call the lower orders, the ignorant, the idle, or the extremely poor. They were, for the greater part, men of clear and calm mind, who saw the absurdity of the popular superstitions, and were equally dissatisfied with the emptiness of the prevalent philosophies. They were in a situation which demanded, on their part, a rigid scrutiny of the reasons of that faith which the populace hated for its purity, and which every priesthood dreaded as a rival; which philosophers passed by with scorn as only one of many superstitions; and which the imperial government resolved to put down by force, because it brought its disciples to submit to a higher throne than Caesar's. We cannot well conceive of such readers of the gospels, without being assured that they would read them with peculiar jealousy; that they were well qualified to judge of the evidence by which they were accompanied; and that they could easily detect the total difference in tone and style between them and all other written stories of the life of Jesus. We know that much anxious communication was held on this very matter.

We should think it in the highest degree probable, that, down to the end of the second century, the historical truth of the gospels would be most severely tested by nearly every one of the three millions, and many more, who believed; and we know, in point of fact, from the character of the early apologies, that such in many instances was actually the case. Did they know what our erudite modern professors adduce with so much confidence? Have any of them said so? Is there any record of this kind? For our part, we do not think so meanly of the intelligence and sagacity of the Christians of the second

century, in the great cities of Europe, Asia Minor, and Africa, as to suppose that they could not distinguish the majestic gravity of the gospels from all other narratives, quite as well as we can. We do not suppose that they would receive corrupted and interpolated copies of other books, for the genuine productions of the witnesses of our Saviour's words and actions. We do not suppose, that they could not have easily detected any admixtures of spurious traditions with the dignified fidelity of Matthew, the graphic descriptions of Mark, the elegant consistency of Luke, and the sublime simplicity of John.

Then the moral integrity of these numerous and well-instructed Christians is to be taken into account. Men who resigned the dearest attractions of the world for their religion, and whose only reason for so doing was identified with the authority of these written gospels, were unlikely to conspire in a deliberate fraud, not only of the most atrocious character as it regarded literature and history, but simply blasphemous according to the Christian view of the gospels. The fact, on all hands acknowledged, is, that all these Christians united, at the end of the second century, in upholding the literary integrity, the historical authority, and the Divine inspiration, of the gospels. Then, did they say that which they knew to be false?—for false it was, and they must have known it so to be, if the mere authority of the church determined that a selection of four gospels out of many, all composed of additions to one original gospel, were the real histories written by two apostles of Jesus Christ, and under the direction of other two. Would these Christians ascribe to the inspiration of the Holy Ghost the compositions which they *knew* to be the work of men? We may be reminded that there are pious frauds, and that this might be one of them.—We understand men, if they say *Christianity is a fraud*. Yet we aver that suppositions, *opposed by evidence*, do not entitle any man to bring so grave an accusation against either the dead or the living. It may be said, that without charging them with intentional fraud, it may be supposed they might have been in error; they might not have the same views, as those which we entertain, of the heinous criminality of such a transaction. Now, admitting that there were persons bearing the Christian name to whom this sort of candid insinuation may apply, it can be fully shown that the great body of Christians were better instructed out of these very gospels, than to fall into such an error. We might appeal, in support of this view, to the inward convictions of every Christian. But there are facts in abundance. The early Christians, that is, the Christians before the third century, were remarkable jealous of the integrity of

their copies of the gospels. In their time the copying of manuscripts was an honourable profession, analogous to that of printing important works and documents among ourselves. The manuscripts, when copied, were subjected to the careful revision of *αντιβαλλοντες δοκιμαζοντες* (*censores*), who affixed their signatures to these revised copies. Noble and illustrious men did not disdain to discharge this important and responsible function.\*

We have the testimony of Irenæus to the fact, that attested copies of the gospels were carefully preserved in the churches of Asia Minor, and of Gaul, and by their elders. Clemens is our witness for the church at Alexandria; Theophilus and Tatian for Antioch; Tertullian for the African churches; Justin, for the churches at Ephesus, and at Rome; Origen for Jerusalem, both the Caesareas, Tyre, and Athens.

The care with which the gospels were preserved from the first, is sufficiently apparent to any intelligent reader of the accounts collected by Eusebius. The writings of Origen likewise prove to us, that the critical art was not unknown, nor uncultivated, in the early churches. Let it be granted that some of the earliest Christian writers, that is, those who wrote before the end of the second century, give quotations from the gospels which do not exactly agree with passages in our gospels: it is well known that the same looseness of citation is found in writers after that time; so that this is no more a proof that the earlier writers used gospels different from ours, than that later writers also used different gospels—an inference which would be contrary to the hypothesis with which we are dealing.

It is of no trifling consequence to bear in mind here, the well-known fact that the Christian writers of the second century accuse the heretics of corrupting the gospels. Whether the charge was well founded or not; or if well founded, to whatever extent the alleged corruption took place, those who brought the charge were sensible of the criminality of such an offence; to us it appears, that in making such a charge they were conscious of their own innocence in that respect. The accusation shows, moreover, that these writers knew, by plain and sufficient evidence, that there were standard copies of the gospels, with which all others could be compared, and by which their faithfulness could be tested.

'I affirm,' says Tertullian, in his six books against Marcion, 'that not only in the churches founded by apostles, but in all

\* Strabo, Geogr. l. 13. Fontanine de Aubrey, Hort. l. ii. c. 3. Valerius, Lib. de Critica, c. 34. Burman's note ad hoc locum. Scholz. Prol. N. T.

which have fellowship with them, that gospel of Luke which we so stedfastly defend, has been received from its first publication. The same authority of the apostolic churches will support the other gospels which, in like manner, we have from them, conformably to their copies.' Again, in his books against heretics, 'They who were resolved to teach otherwise were under a necessity of remodelling the records of the doctrine. As they could not have succeeded in corrupting the doctrine without corrupting the records, so we could not have preserved and transmitted the doctrine in its integrity, but by preserving the integrity of its records.'

The same confidence in the gospels possessed by Christian churches, and horror in contemplating the crime of heretics, is expressed in a passage preserved by Eusebius from an anonymous writer, against the heresy of Artemon :—

' How daring a crime is this, they can hardly be ignorant; for they either do not believe that the Divine Scriptures were dictated by the Holy Spirit, and then they are infidels; or, they believe themselves wiser than the Holy Spirit, and what are they then but madmen ?

' The feeling expressed by these writers was common, without doubt, to Christians generally. But they could not have felt, or have expressed themselves, as they did, if their own copies of the gospels had been left, as is imagined, at the mercy of transcribers, and (if) there had been such a disagreement as must have in consequence existed among them. What text of their own would they have had to oppose to the text of Marcion, or of any other heretic? What would they have had to bring forward but a collection of discordant manuscripts, many of them, probably, differing as much from each other, as the attested gospels of the heretics did from any one of them.

' If our gospels had not existed in their present form till the close of the second century; if, before that time, their text had been fluctuating, and assuming in different copies a different form, such as transcribers might choose to give it, those by whom they were used could not have ventured to speak with so much confidence of the alterations of the heretics. They must have apprehended too strongly the overwhelming retort to which they lay so exposed, and against which they were so defenceless. If, however, any one can imagine that they really would have been bold enough to make the charges which they do against heretics; yet, in this case, they must at least have shown solicitude to guard the point where they themselves were so liable to attack. But no trace of such solicitude appears.'—vol. i. p. 43.

The mere proposal to omit a word or two in the gospel of Matthew was regarded by Origen with reverential apprehension, even though there were slight verbal differences in the copies both of this and of the other gospels. The comparison of

copies was, therefore, a familiar practice. Whatever variations there might be, they could be only such as are now found in copies which are, on all hands, acknowledged to have been derived from one and the same original.

It is now in our own power to examine our existing gospels, for the purpose of ascertaining whether they betray any marks of that patchwork composition which has been ascribed to them. Every scholar who has attended to this matter will bear witness to the facts which we now briefly state.

First, all the gospels differ in their general style and manner, from the remains of all other writings which have come down from before the third century. Secondly, each of the four gospels has a distinctly marked character of its own. Thirdly, the dialect in which the four gospels are written, could not have been sustained, as it is sustained, by interpolators. Besides these facts, there is the broad evidence, lying open to every reader of the gospels, even in a translation. We certainly do not refer to this as of itself proving the genuineness of the four gospels, but as harmonizing with the clear historical proofs of which we have given a summary. We appeal to readers of the gospels, whether they do not find in them such narratives of the life and teaching, the death and resurrection, and ascension of Jesus, as commend themselves by their calm, and unembarrassed, and consistent truthfulness:—the very air and manner of witnesses deposing to what they know to be true. We detect in them no stories of the kind which are contained in the apocryphal gospels. With the utmost ease they bring before us the most singular life that was ever narrated, with no inconsistency, with no word or fact unsuited to the dignity, the wisdom, the benevolence, the practical perfection and completeness of the character of the Son of God living among men. We feel, so to speak, *the tone of originality*, which must have been destroyed or injured by any serious alteration of the primary documents.

It is remarkable enough that Eichorn, whose views we have been examining, has given something very like a refutation of the main ground of his own hypothesis. For, in the second edition of the first volume of his 'Introduction to the New Testament,' he published an additional section on 'The Reception of the Four Gospels for the Use of the Church,' in which he says, that the interval between the years 150 and 175, appears to be the fittest that can be assigned for the silent introduction of this unanimity of opinion respecting those gospels which merited a preference above others, provided any cause can be pointed out which might facilitate such a decision. And such a cause existed. The other gospels either did not bear the

name of any author, or the individual names of their authors were not specified. On the contrary, our four gospels were ascribed, two of them to the apostles Matthew and John, and two to apostolic men worthy of all credit.'

In the last year of his life, 1827, he writes, that the selection of the gospels was not made 'through any formal decision of the church, by means of its most distinguished teachers,' for this could not have been done privately, but through a silent general agreement, during a period of perfect quiet in the church, when men's minds, not being excited by any other causes, none were inclined to set themselves against the reception of any writing that was strange to them; for, without opposition, and in perfect silence, a series of writings, regarded as the authentic records of Christianity, was unanimously received throughout the Christian world, in the east and in the west.' Still further, in the fourth volume of his Introduction, he says, 'that the early Christians proceeded on the principle of admitting into it no book which was not the work of an apostle, or of a scholar and companion of the apostles;' that 'criticism in the perfection to which it has been brought in our age, allies itself to the traditions of the church, and confirms its judgment upon their genuineness as apostolic writings; and, that as the earliest age of Christianity handed down genuine writings to succeeding Christians, so they, during the subsequent period, have preserved these writings uncorrupted.'

Notwithstanding these later views of Eichorn, succeeding writers, such as De Wette and Strauss, still treated this question of the genuineness of the gospels as either doubtful or disproved. The grounds of this incertitude or positive denial, are, as we have seen, precisely the old grounds of infidelity which were long ago exposed, with ample learning and admirable force of argument, in this country.

We are not in the least degree startled by the tokens already visible in Germany, of an approaching conflict,—not among professed Christians,—but between avowed infidels and sincere believers. Holding, as we do, among our most rational and tested convictions, that the gospels which we now read were written by the authors to whom they are ascribed, and that they contain the testimony of inspired witnesses, we have no fears for the issue of the conflict.

There are not wanting in Germany men who are, in all respects, prepared for it. They have seen, long since, that the denial of the miracles recorded in the New Testament, by resolving all the narratives of miracles into peculiar modes of expressing natural events, was a violence offered to the common sense of Christians; that the mythical absurdities of Strauss

would, in time, be rejected by the superficial, as they were, at first, by the well-informed, because they are based on a supposition which virtually regards Christianity as false, and, therefore, not worth explaining or defending; and that, sooner or later, men would be brought back to the old question, *Is Christianity built upon true history, or upon a lie?* As in Germany, so in England, we are certain that all the disguises which infidelity has assumed will be thrown off by a clear-headed and sound-hearted people. The slang of complimentary phrase respecting the Bible will be rated at its real worth, and its latent sense will lie upon the surface. Men will be forced to rank themselves among those who either hate Christianity or care not for it, or are ignorant of the facts of its history, or are unwilling to judge according to evidence.

There are in the English language almost innumerable works on the historical authority of the gospels. The progress of society seems to require not so much the republication of these works, as the reproduction of their materials, in forms and with accompaniments appropriate to the taste of our own times. Professor Norton's work is not offered as a specimen of what we have just been suggesting. For such a purpose it wants vivacity, and is, in other respects, not suitable. But it is highly honourable to the writer's learning and diligence; and as the American edition was dear, and very scarce, we are not surprised that it should be republished in London.

His argument on the genuineness of the gospels is, however, not completed, the author having reserved a third volume, on the Internal Evidences, as a companion to a new translation of the gospels, in which he has been long engaged, but which, so far as we know, has not yet appeared. The most laboured portion of these volumes, and by far the largest, consists of miscellaneous notes on sundry critical questions relating to the gospels, and of very elaborate dissertations on the opinions of the Gnostics. The second volume, which contains these dissertations, is, in reality, a distinct treatise. So, also, is the long and most objectionable note, filling more than a hundred pages of small type, on the books of the Old Testament. As they are now connected we cannot do justice, at the same time, to three departments of inquiry so manifestly distinct from each other, and each suggesting matter for deep and earnest disputation.

Professor Norton has not explained his views of the inspiration of the gospels. He has taken no notice of the promise of our Lord to his disciples, that they should be guided, as the teachers of his religion to mankind, by the Holy Ghost. Neither has he referred to the declarations made by the apostles Paul, Peter, and John, to the effect that they enjoyed this

guidance ; nor to the miraculous signs which they gave of the truth of these declarations.

It may be presumed, that these topics are reserved for his third volume. But we are bound to say, that in the volumes now before us, we have noticed some modes of expression respecting the evangelists, which would not be used by a writer entertaining our views of the inspiration under which the gospels were composed. And his mode of accounting for Paul's knowledge of the facts of our Saviour's life is, according to our judgment, in direct contradiction to that apostle's own express averment. Professor Norton says, he derived it from ordinary sources of information ; the apostle himself solemnly affirms that he received it by revelation from God.

In his exposition of the opinions of the Gnostics, Mr. Norton shows with much force, the peculiar value of their testimony to the genuineness of the gospels, which, it is manifest, they would have impugned, if there had been any ground of doubt respecting them. It will be seen to what school of theologians the professor belongs, when he says, 'the system by which the catholic faith was supplanted among protestants . . . may, perhaps, appear to a *rational* believer of the present day to stand in as open and direct opposition to Christianity as the systems of the leading Gnostics.' We have not space to repel by argument the heavy accusation here brought against the doctrines which we believe to be plainly and clearly taught us in holy Scripture. We cannot characterize it otherwise than as an insidious and unfair mode of obtruding the peculiarities of his own school, upon an inquiry relating to the historical authority of the four gospels.

In the long disquisition on the books of the Old Testament, he acknowledges the Divine mission of Moses, with many of the later German critics ; but he denies that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch, or that the Pentateuch has any claims to be regarded as authentic history ; on the contrary, he does not scruple to speak of it as containing a traditionary *erroneous* account of the early revelations of God to man. He professes his disbelief in the Divine institution of the Levitical ceremonies, which he represents as inconsistent with true religion, and as condemned by the Hebrew prophets. The difficulty placed in the way of these sweeping conclusions by the language of our Saviour respecting Moses, he escapes by the cool expedient of *supposing* that the words of Jesus have not been accurately reported by the evangelists,—that the evangelists unconsciously attributed expressions to him which favoured their own opinions as Jews, and that Jesus himself, on some occasions, adopted the common language of the Jews, founded on their erroneous

conceptions. The same tone of *resolute denial* pervades his observations on the remaining books of the Old Testament; and of prophecy he says: 'Our Saviour accomplished not any express prophecy relating to him; but he came in conformity to an expectation which the whole tenor of God's providence towards their nation had taught the Jews to entertain.' To examine all these positions in detail, would be the work, not of a review, but of a volume. We have long been satisfied, that, like all the arbitrary positions of De Wette, Vater, Ammon, and other writers, those which Professor Norton has here borrowed from them are untenable, and that a much more rational and consistent solution can be given of the difficulties with which they have entangled the whole question of the Old Testament. It is but justice to the author to say, at the same time, that some of his suggestions are worthy of consideration, proceeding, as they apparently do, from a mind of independent habits, richly furnished, and patient in the pursuit of truth. It is our notion that the cause of orthodoxy will be better served by calmly examining what he says, than by hastily denouncing him as an unbeliever. His convictions and prejudices are those of a rationalist. His Christianity is a moral system sanctioned by the doctrine of a future state; ours is a system of recovery from guilt, and depravity, and misery, through faith in an atoning sacrifice; so wide a difference in the views entertained of the Saviour's mission may well be accompanied by a corresponding difference in our views of many subordinate matters. We have no apprehension that Professor Norton's opinions will generally prevail in England; for, as we regard them, they strip our religion of those essential peculiarities to which it owes all its interest, among practically religious people.

Believing that these appendages to Professor Norton's main argument are *fundamentally* inconsistent with the argument itself, and that they belong to the modern German school of infidelity, which is weakened by too many fallacies to beguile our literary judgment, and disgraced by too many impieties to impose on our Christian charity, we feel it to be our duty to record against them, for the present, our deliberate protest.

A more fitting occasion, we doubt not, will arise for proving in detail, that our reasons for this protest are neither few nor weak.

- ART. IV.—1. *On the Salubrity of Great Towns.* By Dr. Monfalcon and Baron de Poliniere. Paris. 8vo. 1846.  
 2. *The Medical Topography of Tours.* By Dr. Duvergé. Tours. 12mo. 1774.

THE French laws are half a century before ours, upon several important points of public salubrity. For example, it is rare to find burial grounds within the walls of a town in France, or even near the houses of a village; and their removal is expressly enjoined. So almost everywhere public slaughter-houses are there built out of the cities, and private ones are forbidden. At the same time, hurtful trades are subjected to regulations which aim at preventing their too close proximity to habitations, and their being carried on so as to become nuisances. Councils of public health, too, exist in some large towns; and an improved Sanitary Bill was before the late Chambers. The subject is examined upon isolated points in several of the reports of Mr. Chadwick, and others belonging to the sanitary movement now so happily advancing to a good issue in England; and, although the general result either of French ways of living, or of the bad condition of French towns be *a much higher rate of mortality than ours*, still those reports show that many French usages deserve to be consulted, in reference to our sanitary reforms. But for those good usages, the deaths in France would probably be far more fearfully excessive.

Such good usages, therefore, are proper subjects of study for us; and as Dr. Southwood Smith, Mr. Chadwick, and their fellow-labourers will be glad to find, able and eminent Frenchmen hold that analogous usages and reforms of ours are worthy of their close examination. So correctly did Lord Mahon, in observing the correspondence of our South-Sea bubbles with Law's Mississippi schemes in Paris, note the mutual influences of events on both sides of the channel.

Those influences do not indeed, always work for good. A French minister seizes too eagerly upon our *commandos* at the Cape, and our *massacres* in New Zealand, to justify the 'inevitable' *razzias* and *slaughters* in Algeria and Tahiti. So Lord John Russell, with singular want of discretion, excused his incorrect information upon the failure of the crops in Ireland, by a reference to the wonderful blindness of the French minister to the bad harvest of France. It would not be a very surprising thing to see the two governments simultaneously palliating their oppressions of the native

Africans in the extreme north and south, by citing their respective dealings with the prisoner chiefs—Abd-el-Kader, the Arab, and the Caffre Sandilla, or Macomo.

It is more agreeable to enlarge upon the good example of international influence; and one fact, in this respect, is highly satisfactory in reference to the French, and to our own observation of *scientific* experiences. On both sides, national jealousies are entirely banished from this pure region. Mr. Cobden, and the Manchester free-traders, could by no ingenuity discover matter of more delightful contemplation, than the eagerness with which the leaders of medical science, or of mechanical science in Paris, Lyons, and elsewhere, watch our successes in the use of chloroform, or in the construction of sewers, or in the removal of nuisances.

If, on our parts, we had looked a little earlier to their city engineering, our laying down of levels would not have waited until 1848 for completion. So long ago as 1833, M. Emmery, of Paris, demonstrated the absolute necessity of beginning with such things in great sewer works.

It is remarkable how many reports are published annually in France, from engineers and other men of science, concerning their visits to our public works, and to our great private undertakings. The Annals of the Ponts et Chausees (the French public board of Civil Engineers, who make roads, bridges, canals, etc.,) ought to be translated into English, if it were only for the *travels* it contains in England. The fine passage in M. Arago's eulogy upon Watt, describing the homage he saw paid to the great Scottish mechanician by *all orders* of men, from Dover to Glasgow, shows, too, the zeal with which the illustrious French savant sought out the testimony of *all orders* of men from Babbages, Herschells, and Faradays, to the humblest artisans of Birmingham and Paisley.

Our visits of scientific discovery, across the channel, are not wanting; but they should be multiplied. The Arthur Youngs among us at the present day, might repeat with benefit an inspection of France, the result of which, in two goodly quarto volumes, gave Napoleon, as he said, for the first time a correct idea of the country. If Sterne's 'Sentimental Journey' will ever delight the idle reader, solid improvement may be gained from more plodding perambulations. The impartial stranger seizes upon things which are familiar to the inhabitants, in new points of view; so that he may sometimes have the satisfaction to teach them a little, while he is himself learning much. An example of this satisfaction has just occurred in the country of Denis Papin, a memoir of whom, from the pen of an English resident at

Blois, the place of his birth, appeared in our July number, last year. An accomplished and learned inhabitant of the city, M. de la Saussaye, a member of the Institute, has since prosecuted the subject with great success. He has obtained important new matter in Germany; and, among other things, an original portrait of Papin, preserved at the university of Marburg. The result of the research is the republication of his works, already in forwardness, under the auspices of M. de la Saussaye, with the aid of the librarian of that university, Hencke, and of the Englishman, who was so fortunate as to suggest the design.

The following observations are the result of a visit to another part of France, Tours, which abounds in British associations, early and present. This visit had the similar characteristic rewards of a friendly reception, and of a valuable discovery in the history of sanitary science. Here was found in a little volume of the last century, perhaps, the origin of the existing French sanitary laws; but certainly a very able exposition, in point of principle, of what is now doing for and what is wanted to complete their system; which interesting points can be cleared up further from the other work lying before us, of the present day. The title of the remarkable book of 1774 is set forth in the note.\* It will be appreciated from the following extract, not one word too long:—

'My object in writing this work,' says the author, 'was not amusement. For that, indeed, the field before me is eminently propitious;—the pleasant hills enclosing Tours north and south; its rich and smiling plains; the waters of the sweet Loire; a thousand striking points of view; an infinite variety of picturesque spots; with an extraordinary assemblage of antique historic chateaux studding this fine province;—all this calls for a master's hand; and might well store the fancy of Tasso with images of beauty and grace. I have a different motive; and limit my labour rigorously to what is useful. The Duke de Choiseul, when minister, ordered all the physicians of the army to record their observations upon the diseases of the troops under them, according to an excellent plan prescribed by M. Richard, the chief of the medical staff. I have pursued that plan with scrupulous care; noting at the same time everything that Tours offers in any manner bearing upon it—such as the means of purifying the air, and of furnishing good water cheap to the inhabitants, with other remarks which appear to me to merit the atten-

\* Mémoire, Topographique, Physique, et Medicinal, ou Traité sur les situation de la ville de Tours; sur la nature de son sol; sur les qualités de l'eau et de l'air; sur la nourriture, le tempéramment, le caractère, les maladies de ses habitans et des Troupes qui y sont en garnison. Par M. Duvergé, M.D. Tours. 12mo. 1774.

tion of the public and of the government. What I thus offer is the fruit of fourteen years' close observation.

'The soil, the water, and the air of Tours have all peculiar characters. The town is situated on the Loire, and at about a mile from the Cher, to the south. Two ranges of hills, 120 feet high, running east and west, rise a little beyond each river. A double row of lofty trees, forming a fine mall, skirt the south side of the town; and beyond the town ditch in that direction, lies a wet and unhealthy district of market-gardens, which receive the filth of the streets for manure.

'I have examined the soil in all directions wherever any cavities have been dug, or the wells could be descended. It is in general a substratum, of sand, or gravel, at a depth varying from thirteen to twenty-eight feet, from the surface. Immediately above the sand, or gravel, is a bed of clay, or potter's earth, two feet thick. Then comes the upper mass varying from eleven to twenty-six feet in thickness. It is black earth composed of the deposited mud of the Loire along with all the refuse of the town constantly accumulated for many centuries. The depth at which several of the most ancient buildings are situated below the present surface, shows the prodigious quantity of such accumulations. The soil of the whole valley between the hills beyond the Loire and the Cher is exactly similar to that of the town of Tours. An analysis of this black earth shews its chemical qualities. It contains very little alkaline salts; but in general it is pure river mud of a slight salt taste, fine sand, and broken shells like those which are found in abundance in the adjacent hills. This composition is rich for agriculture and gardening; and it accounts for the productiveness of the neighbourhood.

'The water at Tours is less favourable, and most important it is in a medical point of view to improve what the inhabitants use. To show this clearly is the main purpose of my memoir. Water so much influences all the natural operations, and it is so useful in all the artificial arrangements of life, that the great chemists have taken infinite pains to discover its essential qualities. Analysis has settled that it often contains all sorts of salts, sulphur, bitumen, and vitriol; and that it commonly dissolves and bears away all the looser particles of the different bodies that it passes through. As to its qualities, it is known when applied cold externally to be astringent and repercussive, when so applied warm to be emollient, relaxing, and penetrating,—when drank, to soften and separate food, to dissolve and mix completely with bile so as to be a principal means of digestion—when conveyed into the blood, to freshen and moisten it, melt its salts, and carry all its other constituent elements into the very smallest vessels, so as to nourish them and keep them up in abundance. In short it may be asserted, that a due proportion cannot be maintained between the solids and fluids of our bodies without a sufficient supply of good water. It is that alone which preserves a proper circulation in the human machine; in other words, which preserves life.

'It is consequently of extreme importance to understand the quality of the water we drink. This may be done easily. The lightest, the clearest, the most limpid water, that which is tasteless, without smell, and is not heavy in the stomach, that which passes readily in the urine,

which forms a complete lather with soap, which boils readily and cools readily, which cooks vegetables quickly, is the best water. Water is wholesome too if it do not injure the teeth when regularly used, nor affect the skin. It is good, also, when it runs over sand or gravel where neither rushes, moss, nor any aquatic plants grow.

' The well-water in Tours is flat and disagreeable to the taste. It soon throws to the surface when drawn a gummy coating, and a muddy sediment falls to the bottom. It immediately thickens upon oil of tartar being put into it. It dries the skin in washing. It should never be used for making bread, for cooking vegetables, or washing with soap, when the river water can be had. When boiled it gives a dark calcareous sediment which effervesces with acids. It is much infected from the privies. This water is exceedingly unwholesome. The Loire water and that of the Cher are about upon a par. That of the fountains which now supply the inhabitants is inferior to them both. It is most surprising that with the Loire at command, its water should not be raised by an hydraulic machine for common use. That operation would not be expensive; and besides furnishing a wholesome beverage by being filtered, it would give a constant supply to water the streets in hot weather, and to cleanse the ditches and sewers, so as to disperse all unhealthy miasma

' The state of the *air* also merits the careful attention of the physician as much as that of the natural philosopher. The movement, the weight, and the elasticity of this element, which have been established by many experiments, sufficiently indicate the effects such an agent must produce upon organised bodies, an agent in direct contact with them, forming part of their essence, and the source of power to their principal parts. This agent must be the more potent, since its mere elasticity is the cause of the most wonderful phenomena of nature. The various effects of air upon our bodies arise from the ready combination of other substances with it,—such as moist vapours, poisonous miasmas from the decomposition of vegetable or animal matter,—or such as the sulphuric, nitric, and saline vapours educed from various soils by the sun, or by the internal heat of the earth. All these things impregnate the air alike, so that it affects our bodies in different ways in different climates. The essential air itself does not vary in different climates; for its nature is everywhere the same; but it has an indefinite property of expansion; and it becomes more or less pure, more or less flowing, more or less healthy; sometimes even dangerous and deadly, according as it is charged with particles which in different countries are more or less suitable to our constitutions.

' The influence of air upon the human body is analogous to its effect upon animals, and upon all sorts of vegetables, I may add, and upon metals—in one word, the hardest, the most compact, the most indissoluble substances: for all nature is subject to air. That influence which is thus universal, is also most various according to the difference of situation, and of climate, and to the changes of the atmosphere.

' The fatal character of these variations is sometimes seen in one species of animals, sometimes in another. One season carries off half our horned stock, another half our horses. For several years past the

fowls, and especially the dogs, have been destroyed. The last case was the more unaccountable, inasmuch as the food of these animals being the same as ours, their failure could not be attributed as with quadrupeds to the state of the pastures. The proof that an atmospheric exposure of individuals produced these fatal consequences is, that the diseases were general. The further proof that they came from the atmosphere is, that the same symptoms preceded their breaking out in all the cases. The tongue was always affected in the cattle disease so fatal a few years ago; with the dogs it is the head and chest that suffer.

' So in vegetables the very same uniformity of atmospheric influence occurs. Every season is fatal to some one sort of tree or plant. The most skilful gardener could not select the several kinds of shrubs more correctly than the fog strikes them. It turns one whole class of pear-trees, for instance, yellow, and spares all others. It will destroy all the buds of that class without attacking the leaves, or all the leaves without injuring the fruit.

' These facts are well established, but they are not commonly estimated at their due value. They shew clearly, that to the air alone must be attributed the great part of the endemic and epidemic maladies which afflict mankind. It is this maxim of Hippocrates, that air is the ruler of all things, and the source of disease. Indeed, no one can doubt that sore throats, which come and increase so rapidly in a thick fog, are caused by the malignant character of the vapours, its component parts. Every part of the body in turn is attacked by those vapours; one day the lungs, another day the chest, which loses its tone. Again—the eyes, often so susceptible to atmospheric changes, escape altogether. Volumes might be filled with the various cases, the origin of which may be traced to those changes. They are the more formidable for being quite unavoidable. The mercury in a barometer shut up close in a room rises and falls just as it would in the open air. In one word, it is matter of daily experience, that gout, corns, and rheumatism become intensely painful, and again are moderated with every vicissitude of heat and cold, wet and dry. The conclusion, from this state of the case as to the transient effects of the air in its changes, is that when it is steadily in the same condition any where, its influence upon us must be great and lasting.

' These general principles as to air, are strikingly illustrated by experience at Tours. It is a town situated between two rivers, the Loire and the Cher, both often inundated. This, with the stagnation of the rain water in the town, renders it exceedingly damp. Hence the frequency of epidemic fevers. The bad state of the sewers increases the tendency to such diseases. The fogs so charged are disagreeable to the smell, and corrupt the atmosphere. In the drier seasons, alkaline and putrid vapours, which compose these fogs, may be scattered more widely, but they infect the air still. Thus it becomes the vehicle of many diseases of equal danger and frequency. Such are the intermittent fevers, obstinate fevers (*fièvres rebelles*), mesenteric fevers, nervous, putrid, and scarlet fevers. I suspect that a disease reputed to have been contagious, and which prevailed in Tours for twenty-eight years together, was nothing more than a fever of the last class. It broke out in a parish subject to a bad, moist atmosphere; and the first victims being buried in the church and cemetery of that parish, rendered the air daily worse.

' In fact the air of Tours does not possess in a proper degree the qualities pointed out by Hippocrates, by Arbuthnot, Boerhaave, and other great physicians as essential to its perfection—dryness and clearness. A dry and clear air passes into the lungs, and through their vessels, unobstructed. Their smooth, unbroken coats, which reject the more gross particles floating about in a corrupt atmosphere, sift such pure air more easily than any other. This sifted air is believed now to have become the very element of fire needful to give fresh life to the blood in the lungs; and to convert it from being the blood of the veins into that of the arteries, and to raise its tone. On the contrary, damp air which is charged with heterogenous particles injures the lungs, and weakens their spring. Thus the column of air which each breath sends into the branches only reaches the blood with extreme difficulty, not even purified enough to make it circulate with vigour. Such a moist atmosphere with the frequent variation from heat to cold, to which Tours is subject, tends to increase most chronic complaints. The air of Tours cannot be made dry by any art: *but it might be made pure* by removing the causes of its bad vapours.

' The government has made a beginning towards this object by widening and paving the streets. This will tend to the removal of vast quantities of animal and vegetable matter which now cover these streets, and are kept too long with the manure from the stables. Its speedy removal would improve the air. The same result would follow a greater cleanliness of the houses. The sewers should be better built, and thoroughly washed. In all directions they are now mere collections of all the filth of the town. They want a regular system of falls, and a supply of water by machinery from the Loire. Another means of purifying the atmosphere of Tours would be the ceasing to bring the dead within its walls, and to select a more distant cemetery. It is a great mistake to suppose that respect can only be shewn to the dead by making their graves the source of infection to the living. Upon this principle the parliament of Paris has prohibited more burials in the churches of that capital. This good law would be improved by their prohibition within the city. The epitaph which Verreyen left for himself shewed him to be a man of real sense and piety. It ran thus:—

' Philip Verreyen has chosen this spot for his grave, in order that the church might not be profaned by his body, nor the air infected by its dangerous exhalations.'

' Bernard Ramazini maintains the same opinion, and Canon Porce, of Caen, has lately placed its correctness in a clearer light.

' Then the manufactories of starch ought to be removed from the houses. Their dangerous character has been certified by the medical college. The milk and butter from the cows fed on the refuse of the grain used there, as well as the flesh of the animals, are known to be poisonous. The police has already condemned them; but hitherto its judgment has been evaded, through the injudicious protection of some well-meaning, but mistaken members of the administration.

' Lastly, the deep stagnant ditches, and low grounds round the town should be levelled and filled up, or cut through. They are covered with slimy, putrid matter, and give out a dangerous miasma. The stench from them offends the passer by, and a deadly vapour is continually

emanating from them. The cut through these should be regularly washed from sluices supplied by the machinery at the Loire already recommended.'

Dr. Duvergé adds, that the cattle fed in these marshes were diseased.

He afterwards expatiates upon the importance of meteorological observations to the physician, who ought not, he says, to enter the sick room without noting the direction of the wind, the degree of cold and heat, the state of the atmosphere.

He adds, that Hippocrates taught this lesson, which all the great physicians since his time have repeated.

Thus, seventy years ago, Dr. Duvergé denounced cess-pools, intra-mural churchyards, neglected sewers, and all sorts of nuisances, to which we are only beginning to be alive; and many of which, even in France, still continue to destroy the people by tens of thousands. His work was not, however, without effect; and it has been followed, where it appeared, by a succession of similar productions from able physicians.\* The Medical Society of Tours has recently proved its just sense of the doctrines of Dr. Duvergé, by warmly seconding an effort now making to realize and improve upon his principles of purifying the air, and supplying good water in abundance to the people of that town.

Indeed, strong traces of his doctrines are to be found in the transactions of the society. For example, the following case from one of the early volumes would have been eagerly recorded by Dr. Duvergé. It is a lesson from nature, which art should adopt.

'After a great overflow of the Loire,' says the Report of 1806, 'its borders were covered with slime, from which proceeded a marshy miasma in all directions. Immediately afterwards, a torrent of rain fell for two hours, followed by a strong west wind, and two wet days. The mud was washed, in a great measure, clean, so as to disperse much of the miasma. The wind carried away the rest; and the inhabitants escaped with a very few cases of fever, which had broken out before the change of weather.'

What the rains effected in this instance might be most usefully accomplished by supplies of water.

Dr. Bouriat, the learned secretary of the society when the foregoing extract was written, was long strenuous in his appeals

\* Dr. Bouriat's Letter to Sir James Coyle, on the Climate of Towns, 1816; and Dr. Pommier's Medical Topography of Tours, 1827: the Transactions of the Medical Society of Tours, 1802—1848, contains rich store of such observations.

to the government to adopt means for cleansing the ditches whose bad condition was pointed out by Dr. Duverg . Some years afterwards a medical officer of cavalry stationed at Tours, Dr. Pommier, followed with an able little work written on the same principles. Much has been done in conformity with these successive judgments of competent men, and always with effect.

Tours is, in fact, two towns in one. It has healthy and unhealthy quarters. The healthy are those which are well aired and well cleaned ; the unhealthy are those quarters which are still in the old state. Occasionally in both cases exceptions occur which baffle medical science.

The year of the cholera-morbus, 1832, brought fatal confirmation to the correctness of this statement. At Tours, as elsewhere, the generally unhealthy streets were the most attacked with the prevailing malady. The eloquent and sagacious historian, M. Blanc, has emulated Thucydides and Defoe in his masterly picture of this new plague, which so prodigiously exceeded in fatality that of Athens, and that of London ; and he notes with due discrimination the fact, that filth and neglect were the usual attractions to its visitation. The rare exceptions were only noticed by the close and scientific observer of Nature's caprices. On this occasion the Medical Society of Tours examined the subject with extreme care ; and proposed a wise system of street cleansing for the future.

During the fifteen years which have since elapsed, many great changes have taken place respecting that point, and respecting the partial draining of the town. All these changes justify to the full the principles upon which the new science of public health is founded. They are an earnest that what remains to be done in this particular town, will want neither zeal, nor intelligence for its early accomplishment ; and Tours is a sufficiently important town to be followed by others in so good a work.

The book of Dr. Monfalcon, and Baron de Poliniere, on the salubrity of great towns, furnishes more recent light upon this great social reform. A brief sketch of its contents would not do justice to the work ; and it is important enough for a separate examination. It presents a complete picture of the practice in France in regard to sanitary establishments, with those of one great town, Lyons, in detail. It also enlarges upon our own sanitary inquiries, and surveys, rapidly, those of other nations, ancient and modern. If the learned authors had not expressly offered their book as a small portion only of their researches, the reader would have pronounced it a complete treatise upon public health.

ART. V.—*Life of William Allen, with Selections from his Correspondence.* 8vo. 3 vols. London: Charles Gilpin.

ON the 19th of January, 1788, in the chamber of a small house in Spitalfields, and in the evening of the day, a youth, of good talents but limited education, who had just completed his seventeenth year, began for the first time to commit to paper a daily record of his thoughts and feelings, his actings and experiences. The lad was William Allen, son of Job and Margaret Allen, honest and worthy people, members of the Society of Friends, then engaged in the manufacture of silk, and thereby doing well in the world. The diary, continued with but few intermissions during a period of more than half a century, was faithfully kept, and at length embraced the almost entire history of a long and useful life.

The very first entries distinctly indicate the character that was in process of formation. They are brief, but pointed and spiritual. The young disciple records the ‘comfort’ he had ‘experienced in striving against evil thoughts,’ regrets his ‘impatience,’ resolves to ‘spend no time unprofitably,’ and meditates on the ‘happy state of those who are led and guided by the spirit of truth.’ These were profitable thoughts for ‘seventeen;’ they proved that the endeavours of his pious parents to make religion attractive to him had not been in vain; and they harmonize with the emotions of love and gratitude which, even in early childhood filled his eyes with tears, as he repeated to his schoolmistress ‘the evening hymn.’

William was already a decided ‘Friend,’ and fully able to estimate the principles professed by that society. He mourns to hear it said ‘by a person not of our society,’ that ‘the Quakers are the proudest people upon earth, and the most difficult to be pleased in their apparel;’ and he is satisfied that ‘those who give occasion for such remarks are not Quakers, whatever they may call themselves.’ The ‘ministry’ of Friends is to him accompanied by ‘a Divine sweetness.’ John Pemberton advises him to ‘be faithful in small things,’ and the words are recorded as the utterances of an oracle. James Thornton remarks, ‘Every act of obedience to the Divine requiring brings strength, and every act of disobedience, weakness,’ and the sentiment is noted down for everlasting remembrance. ‘Surely,’ he observes, ‘there is something more than words in the testimonies of the servants of the Lord; something within us bears witness to the truth, and what is it but the good spirit of God?’ Meetings for worship are ‘favoured seasons’

to him ; he discerns there ‘the excellency of a true gospel ministry ;’ enjoys ‘particular satisfaction in the company of friends,’ and feels ‘a great love and an enlargement of heart towards them.’

The *benevolent* affections were not less fully developed. He longs to be the means of relieving suffering, and sympathises both with man and brute. The ‘tyranny and oppression exercised towards the poor Africans,’ and the reflection that ‘so many thousands are yearly murdered in the disgraceful slave-trade,’ ‘affect him deeply, and as sugar is undoubtedly one of the chief commodities procured by the labour of slaves,’ he resolves, ‘through Divine assistance, to persevere in the disuse of it, until the slave-trade shall be abolished ;’ a resolution to which he stedfastly adhered for forty-three years. The death of ‘a faithful dog,’ killed by accident in the street, causes him ‘a day of bitterness and sorrow ;’ and as for those who are ‘cruel to animals,’ he will put ‘no confidence in them even in the common concerns of life.’ Tender-hearted, conscientious, watchful, averse to the society of persons who had no sense of religion, and alive to the ‘secret impressions of duty,’ God guided his steps in purity ; ‘he lived unpolluted by the world ; and his young heart hated sin.’

During the whole of the period thus referred to, and probably until he was about two and twenty, he remained under the parental roof, and was employed in his father’s business. But, although ‘diligent and attentive,’ he had no taste for the manufacture of silk. His mind had already received a decided bias in favour of scientific pursuits. Even while a child he had ‘a particular predilection for chemistry, and was persevering in his efforts to obtain an experimental knowledge of this science. Astronomy was also a favourite study, and at the age of fourteen, he had himself constructed a telescope with which he could see the satellites of Jupiter. In describing the circumstance he said, that ‘not being strong in cash,’ he was obliged to go economically to work ; he accordingly purchased an eyepiece, an object glass, for which he paid one shilling ; he then bought a sheet of pasteboard, which cost twopence, and having made his tubes, and adjusted his glasses, he found, to his great delight, that the moons were visible. Thus, for fourteen-pence, he obtained a source of enjoyment, the recollection of which always afforded him pleasure.’

The close of the year 1792 first associates William Allen with Plough Court, Lombard Street ; Joseph Gurney Bevan having introduced him into the chemical establishment carried on there under his able superintendence. In this new and more agree-

able situation his peculiar talents soon became manifest. He devoted himself with characteristic ardour to the duties of his position, and within three years, in consequence of the retirement of Mr. Bevan, he became leading partner in the house, and opened a laboratory at Plaistow. Soon after this he unites with other friends in the formation of a Philosophical Society;\* takes to ‘sitting up all night, preparing for lectures and making experiments;’ becomes ‘very low’ for want of letters from a certain ‘dear Mary Hamilton,’ then residing at Redruth; and, finally, as after this intimation might be expected, is happily married to the lady of his choice.

William Allen was now a busy and a prosperous man. Literary and scientific pursuits, the claims of an extending business, experiments, lectures, meetings at Guy’s, and medical studies, employed his days and frequently absorbed his nights; while competence, peace, and domestic felicity shed their blessings on his path, and cheered and refreshed him under labours which would otherwise have been overwhelming.

But he was soon to learn, by bitter experience, the uncertainty of all earthly joy. On the 6th of September, 1797, just ten months after marriage, his beloved companion gave birth to a daughter, and five days afterwards passed into the unseen and eternal world. His grief was deep and abiding. For a season it seemed as if his soul refused to be comforted. For years afterwards, his journal bears constant testimony to the tenderness of his love, and to the depth of his sorrow. Divine consolations were, however, richly mingled in his cup of bitterness, and he was soon made sensible of the blessedness of the discipline to which his ‘tortured heart’ was subjected. He one morning relates, that he had experienced such a flow of heavenly peace as humbled his spirit exceedingly. ‘I seemed,’ he says, ‘to have somewhat of a sight and feeling of the disposition which prevailed in heaven; such a unity, such a lamb-like spirit, such a profound peace; no jar, no contention, nothing wrathful there. I saw that the world could not comprehend this state, and strong were my desires that I might be kept out of its parties, its noises, and its bustles, and be even esteemed a fool for Christ’s sake. It was, indeed, a memorable time, and my heart overflowed.’

Indications of spiritual growth at this period appear in various parts of the diary. On one occasion he observes, ‘I seemed willing to part with all, that I might win Christ. O

\* Luke Howard, William Phillips, Joseph Fox, W. H. Pepys, and Samuel Woods, were among the earliest members. Astley Cooper, Dr. Babington, Tillock, and others, joined afterwards.

how have I longed for a more intimate knowledge of him. May I never love anything more than him ! but be favoured to keep everything in subordination, yea, under my feet.' He often commemorates the 'sweet solace' he found 'in waiting upon the Lord,' and urges the petition, 'make me one of those sheep of whom thou hast said, 'they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand.'

With this spirit of dependence there was combined habitual watchfulness, and an incessant struggle after higher practical virtue. Hence he determines 'to abridge the time devoted to natural science, and to fast from it,' lest it should absorb the heart. Again, he resolves to be exceedingly careful to avoid every share of egotism, the nurse of vanity. 'I feel,' he says, 'great self-contempt when I detect myself in doing anything to be seen of men. How minute are the ramifications of selfishness ! Soul, keep in the valley, be content to let any one take the precedence, study to *be* more than to *seem*.' And again, 'I have seen the beauty, and long to attain to, that heavenly disposition of mind that seeks constantly to render those around us happy. May I be favoured to guard against peevishness, even when just cause, or what appears so, is given, and also to strive against foolish lightness !'

The death of his father, which took place about three years after this, and the subsequent decease of a beloved brother 'possessed of a remarkably sweet and amiable disposition,' opened afresh wounds which had never healed, and led him with increased earnestness to desire that he might be made 'an instrument in the Divine hand of usefulness to others, and at the same time, be preserved from the flattery and applause of a world lying in wickedness.'

But it is time to turn from these brief notices of the *inner life* of William Allen, in order to pursue with rapid pen the narrative of his public course, and more prominent philanthropic labours.

We left him in 1797, a happy but a toiling man, his days and nights alike devoted to the claims of business and science. For a time, domestic bereavements checked his ardour and turned the current of his thoughts; but it was only for a season. Two years afterwards, we find him again immersed in the search after all knowledge. One day in connection with Astley Cooper, and Dr. Bradley, he is eagerly engaged in experiments on respiration, breathing the gaseous oxide of azote; until fixed eyes, purple face, swollen veins, and apoplectic stertor alarm his friends, and conclude the investigation. On another, with his friend Pepys, he is freezing quicksilver with the muriate of lime and snow, or fusing platina with oxygen or charcoal. A little

later he is shut up with Humphrey Davy, enjoying his experiments in electricity ; and the day following he is at Fox's with Dr. Jenner and others, considering a paper on the cow-pox, to be read by the doctor that night at Guy's. Nothing comes amiss to him. He is always ready, always laborious.

In 1801 he commenced a series of lectures to the members of the Askesian Society,\* which were well attended. In 1802 he was elected a fellow of the Linnaean Society, and became, in conjunction with Dr. Babington, a lecturer on chemistry at Guy's Hospital. In 1803 he was chosen one of the presidents of the Physical Society at Guy's, and, by the advice of Davy and John Dalton, of Manchester, accepted a proposition from the Royal Institution to become one of their lecturers. At this period, the demands made upon his time and attention were unusually heavy. He was frequently referred to for chemical analysis, and called upon to perform experiments which required, not only skill and accuracy, but extensive scientific attainments. Plough Court became distinguished for the excellence of its chemical re-agents ; its fame in this department extending from England to the continent. Professor Pictet, of Geneva, speaks of 'a charming collection' he had been enabled to obtain from this famous repository, and which he had exhibited to the National Institute.

The year 1804 found Mr. Allen, if possible, still more engaged. During the season of that year, he delivered at the hospital forty-six lectures on chemistry, as a first course ; twenty-six as a second ; and fifteen on natural philosophy. Twenty-one other lectures at the Royal Institution, made the total number delivered one hundred and eight.

In following years, and amid similar avocations, he contrived to engage largely in botanical studies,—'had always some French work on hand ;' made considerable progress in German ; paid attention to drawing ; read mathematics with a tutor, and pursued astronomical observations somewhat extensively ;†

\* This was the later name of the Philosophical Society before referred to.

† William Allen had, for some time, been occasionally occupied in preparing tables of the right ascension and declination of the stars, from the first to the fourth magnitude, with the places of some of the most interesting double stars. They were arranged for his own amusement, but as they seemed likely to prove useful to persons possessing a circular or transit instrument, he was induced to publish them. In this little work, entitled, 'A Companion to the Transit Instrument,' the variations in right ascension and declination are given to the end of 1814. His fondness for the study of astronomy rendered his observatory a great source of gratification to him, and there, at the close of many a weary day, were his toils forgotten in the interest of this delightful science.

although, as we shall afterwards have occasion to notice, he was at this very time engaged in an almost countless succession of philanthropic undertakings. He seems also to have been much interested in a series of *conversazioni* held at Dr. Babington's, where Count Bourdon gave instructions in Crystallography; and he subsequently took part with others in the formation of the Mineralogical and Geological Societies. He also became an honorary member of the Board of Agriculture, and delivered lectures to the members 'on wheel carriages,' on 'roads,' and on 'the application of mechanical principles to agricultural instruments.'

In March, 1807, he was introduced by Earl Morton, at Sir Joseph Banks's; and in the November following was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society. A paper, 'on diamonds,' prepared by Mr. Pepys and himself, was read at the meeting in June, and soon afterwards the two friends presented some valuable researches on carbon, and carbonic acid, which were printed in the transactions, and excited much interest in the scientific world. Davy told them, that had the paper on carbonic acid been the production of one person only, the council would have voted the gold medal for it, but they found some difficulty in doing so where two parties were engaged.

Twelve years only had as yet elapsed since Mr. Allen, a plain and unknown man, had succeeded to the business at Plough Court; yet these had proved sufficient to enable him altogether to change his position in society. He was now known, appreciated, honored. The most eminent men of the age were numbered among his personal friends. His scientific reputation was established. He was becoming distinguished as a philanthropist. Fame and wealth spread their seductions before him; for everything he undertook prospered. All things betokened a bright if not a brilliant career. It was an hour of peril. Happily for him, he knew his weakness and was alive to his danger. 'If I am preserved,' he says, 'from falling a victim to the world, its honors, and its friendships, I shall be inclined to consider it a miracle of mercy. O, that my feet were permanently fixed on the sure foundation, even Jesus Christ!'

His pious mother, for whom he always manifested the most tender love, was at this time deeply anxious lest his passion for science and pursuit of knowledge, should lead him away from objects of higher importance. She had long been in the habit of conveying to him in writing the religious concern she felt on his behalf, and she now addressed to him two letters, which, for touching and simple beauty, have we think, seldom been surpassed.

'Thy talents, my beloved child,' pleads the unworldly, and, (O, rare excellence!) *unambitious* mother, 'if rightly directed, would tend to spread heavenly knowledge, and to extend the government of the Prince of Peace.'

'Oh, how I long that the Most High would anoint and appoint dedicated sons, to turn the attention of men to their greatest good, and arouse them from their beds of ease before the solemn sound goes forth, —'Time shall be no longer.' He who has loved thee from thy earliest youth, has called thee to love him; *above all*, to dedicate thyself to him; to surrender *thy all* to him, to be made use of as he shall direct. The reins of government should not be in *thy* hands, but in *his*, to turn thee *into* the path he may in future appoint, and *out* of what thou, as a man, would'st have chosen for thyself. Ah! my dear, it is not the strength of natural affection which leads me to say, thou wast not intended to spend all thy time in earthly pursuits, but through submission to the operation of that power which creates anew, thou art designed to lead the minds of others, both by example and precept, from earth to heaven. I believe it may be said of thee, as it was said to Peter, 'Satan hath desired to have thee, that he may sift thee as wheat,' but I humbly hope that the same advocate will plead for thee, that *thy faith fail not.*'

On another occasion she writes,

'I entreat thee again to consider the necessity of setting thyself more at liberty in future. *Thou art too much absorbed in study, my beloved child*, for however innocent it may be, yet, like the doves in the temple, it fills up a place in the temple of thy heart, which ought to be otherwise occupied and dedicated to the Lord, in whose hands thou wouldest become an instrument to promote the knowledge of pure Christianity. *Come, my beloved, if a right hand, or a right eye be called for, give it up*,—the Lord loves a cheerful giver, and he will restore thee an hundred-fold.'

The attachment which subsisted between William Allen and the excellent 'Margaret,' his ever-watchful mother and sympathizing friend, was all but romantic. Her letters were preserved as hidden treasures. He carried them in his pocket-book as constant companions. In seasons of affliction and discouragement he was consoled by her sympathy, and strengthened by her counsel. In advanced life, when age and infirmities gathered about her, his attentions were unremitting. His visits to her were almost daily. His chief joy was to soothe her sufferings, or to minister to her wants. Twenty-two years after the date of the letters, and nine before her decease, for she lived to a good old age, we find him noting in his journal, that he had been to see his dear mother, who was in a sweet state of mind, and described to him some of the feelings with which she had been favoured in the night. 'I was affected,' he says, 'and told her I longed that we could go together, for we seemed to have a foretaste of the glory that should be revealed; but she said, "No, no, there is more for *thee* to suffer and to do yet;

the Lord has a work for *thee*.' In the month of January, 1820, we find him by her bed-side, offering prayer that the 'blessed Saviour might be pleased to administer to her an easy entrance into his everlasting rest,' and, on the 15th of that month, about seven o'clock, the 'beloved parent' sweetly 'slept in Jesus.'

We have hitherto almost exclusively confined our notices of Mr. Allen's public life to his engagements as a man of science; we must now, but still more rapidly, track his course as a philanthropist.

The first intimation we have in his journal of movement in this direction, is found under date of December, 1796, when he purposed, if he can get a little more at liberty, to lay some plan for the amelioration of the state of the poor. The following year, about the same time, William Phillips and himself united to form, what was long after known as 'The Spitalfields' Soup Society.' Into this scheme he threw himself, heart and soul. A large and effective committee was formed; liberal contributions were secured; and a vast amount of suffering was alleviated, at a comparatively small cost. In March, 1798, his name was proposed on the committee of 'The Society for Bettering the Condition of the Poor'; but he is 'in a strait about it,' as many of the members are of the nobility, and he is 'fearful' that he 'may not keep his place as a *Friend*.' This difficulty was, however, soon overcome; no one being disposed to quarrel with the peculiarities of the society to which he belonged. In 1800 and 1801, the soup society was again in operation, (bread was then sometimes seventeen-pence-halfpenny the quartern loaf, and all other food proportionably dear); and day after day is devoted to 'the soup-house,' 'the soup committee,' 'domiciliary visits to the poor,' and such like labours of love.

Mr. Allen does not appear to have been actually elected a member of the committee for the abolition of the slave-trade until May, 1805, but in spirit he was united with it from his youth up.\* His intimacy with Clarkson commenced in 1794, Plough Court being frequently the home of 'that apostle of humanity,' when in town, on the business of the slave-trade. In 1841, he paid his last visit to Playford Hall. They were

\* The little band of labourers who first formed themselves into a committee, to promote the great work of abolition, were—William Dillwyn, George Harrison, Samuel Hoare, Thomas Knowles, M.D., John Lloyd, and Joseph Woods. Their first meeting was held in 1783. The mode they pursued, was enlightening the public mind, and some of their efforts proved highly useful. In 1787, a society was formed upon a more extended scale, when the names of Granville Sharpe, Thomas Clarkson, and several others were added to the committee.

then both old men, and they spent a happy hour in discoursing on old times. At parting, Allen, deeply affected, could only say, ‘The Lord bless thee!’ Clarkson wept. They had been friends for half a century, and they had a mutual conviction that they should meet no more on earth.

The date of Mr. Allen’s first introduction to Wilberforce is not given. He dines with him, apparently for the first time, in August, 1805, where he meets Charles Grant, and others. From this time an intimacy subsisted between them which lasted for life. On the 30th July, 1833, Mr. Allen notes in his diary, ‘Yesterday, died William Wilberforce.’ ‘His warfare is accomplished; his course is finished; he kept the faith. Those who regard him merely as a philanthropist, in the worldly sense of that abused term, know but little of his character; his philanthropy took its origin in love to God, it was kindled at the sacred fire of Divine love, and it burned with such bright and steady lustre, only because it was duly replenished from its hallowed source.’\*

The name of Brougham first occurs in 1810, as having ‘lately been brought into parliament,’ where he had made ‘some judicious observations’ relating to the island of Trinidad. A few months afterwards, the future lord chancellor is dining with him, a friendship having commenced between them, which, in spite of occasional ‘torrents of invective,’ remained unimpaired.

Lord John Russell first calls at Plough Court, in 1825, when he evidently makes a favourable impression. Soon after this, his lordship joins the ‘Society for the Improvement of the Labouring Classes,’ and begins to take a prominent part in the affairs of the British and Foreign School Society. Increasing acquaintance with Lord John deepened William Allen’s personal respect for him, and confirmed the early faith he cherished in the talents and integrity of the Whig leader, who fully reciprocated the esteem of his venerable friend.

In July, 1808, a party of seven† dined together at Plough Court, and formed ‘The Society for diffusing information on the subject of Punishment by Death;’ Basil Montague undertaking to open a communication with Sir Samuel Romilly, on the subject. Mr. Allen’s anxiety for the amelioration of the criminal code was very great, and his efforts on behalf of crimi-

\* These observations were adopted, from a brief obituary of the deceased.

† Basil Montague, Thomas Furley, B. M. Forster, R. Phillips, F. Smith, J. G. Bevan, and Luke Howard.

nals condemned to die for comparatively slight offences, were always unwearied and frequently successful. It is difficult to believe now, that so late as 1813, the greatest efforts were necessary to prevent the extreme sentence of the law from being carried into effect on a poor wretch, not twenty-two years of age, extremely ignorant, unable either to read or write, and exhibiting no indications of a ferocious disposition,—who, it seems, crept in at the window of a house, stole property to the amount of a few shillings, and withdrew without any attempt to commit a personal injury. Yet this was the fact. Well might Mr. Allen, writing, as a last resource, a long personal letter to Lord Sidmouth, indignantly exclaim :—

‘ Shall a person,—to whom, be it remembered, society has failed in its duty, by suffering him to grow up in ignorance,—for the crime of stealing to the amount of a few shillings, and without any aggravating circumstances, suffer the very same punishment which you inflict upon him who has been guilty of the most barbarous murder, and, in short, endure the greatest punishment which one human being can inflict upon another ? To reform the guilty, and to restore them as useful members of the community, is a glorious triumph of humanity, and marks a state rising in the scale of civilization ; but to have no other resource than the punishment of death, reminds me of the miserable subterfuge of a barbarous age, barren in expedients to save, strong only to destroy.’

‘ It is gratifying to know that this appeal was successful. ‘ I am glad,’ says Mr. Allen, in a letter to Sir Robert Harry Inglis, ‘ that this affair has given me an opportunity of being better acquainted with Lord Sidmouth’s real character, of which, from what I have seen myself, I shall think more highly than ever.’

Early in the year 1813, Mr. Allen was planning the establishment of ‘ savings banks.’ ‘ Hast thou,’ (he writes to Richard Reynolds of Bristol) turned thy attention to the subject of a bank for the poor, in which their little savings of threepence or sixpence a week might accumulate for their benefit ? I have consulted Morgan, the great calculator, and he is to sketch me a plan.’ Three years afterwards (January the 20th, 1816) he notes, ‘ Charles Barclay, Charles Dudley, and Robert Stevens, met me at Plough Court, on the subject of savings banks for the poor, and we laid the first stone of the building.’

On the 13th of February, 1814, Wilberforce calls upon him, and states that ‘ he has heard that the Lascars and Chinese kept at Ratcliff, had been very ill used. Would Clarkson and himself see what could be done ? This was enough. Away he flies to the rescue of these unfortunate strangers. An order is immediately obtained, to visit and inspect the barracks where two hundred were lodged ; and a ‘ Lascars Society’ is imme-

diately founded. The committee meet regularly at Plough Court; Mr. Wontner, of the Minories, and other humane inhabitants of the district, having kindly undertaken to act on behalf of these poor creatures. The same year he is assisting in the formation of 'the Peace Society,' and in 1815, projecting an institution for the reformation of juvenile criminals.

But there is literally no end of his devices for doing good. The volumes before us groan under his activities. The very pages become heavy and oppressed with the ever returning record of conferences, committees, and appointments. We shall therefore only add, that in June, 1816, 'with the sole object of stimulating to virtue and active benevolence, by pointing out to those who have the disposition and the power, the means of gratifying the best feelings of the heart; and to show that all, even the poorest, may render material assistance in ameliorating the condition of man;' he established, and with the help of friends, conducted a periodical entitled the 'Philanthropist.' This journal, which was warmly supported by Clarkson, Brougham, William Crawford, and many other benevolent individuals, was continued till 1820, having by that time extended to seven octavo volumes.

To the promotion of popular education, Mr. Allen, it is well known, was through life zealously devoted. In mentioning the first visit he paid to Lancaster's school, in the Borough Road, he says, 'I can never forget the impression which the scene made upon me. Here I beheld a thousand children collected from the streets, where they were learning nothing but mischief, all reduced to the most perfect order, and training to habits of subordination and usefulness, while learning the great truths of the gospel from the Bible. The feelings of the spectator while contemplating the results which might take place in this country and the world in general, by the extension of the system thus brought into practice by this meritorious young man, were overpowering, and found vent in tears of joy.'

In the year 1808, Lancaster resigned his affairs, which were then sadly embarrassed, into the hands of trustees; and on the formation of the British and Foreign School Society, which took place in the course of that year, Mr. Allen became treasurer. His advances for some years after the appointment were heavy, and frequently under circumstances which involved risk of repayment. An extraordinary effort was required to raise funds for the liquidation of the debt with which the society was encumbered, and it was at length only accomplished by enormous sacrifices of time on the part of a few individuals. The misunderstanding which soon after sprang up between Lancaster

and his trustees, greatly aggravated a burden which had already become nearly insupportable.

The first thing needed was a regular set of books, and properly arranged accounts. These Mr. Allen undertook to prepare, and he speaks of ‘labouring as hard in unravelling matters,’ as ever he did in his own concerns. This, however, was but the beginning of trouble. The books and accounts arranged, and a sufficient sum of money raised on loan at five per cent., to place the establishment on a permanent basis, subscriptions had to be secured, expenditure reduced, operations systematised, buildings erected, a society in name to be made a society in fact; and all had to be effected under a load of obloquy, and in the face of unceasing misrepresentation. A work like this required years of labour, and the diary bears witness that *years* were cheerfully devoted to it.

In 1811, notes occur to this effect,—‘Very much overdone this week. I think school concerns altogether have taken up nearly three days.’ Again, in 1812, ‘Of all the concerns that I have any thing to do with, the Lancasterian lies the most heavily on my mind.’ Again, in 1814, ‘Busy at school accounts, much exhausted.’ And thus on he went, day after day, week after week, year after year. School meetings, canvassings for money, journeys, and foreign correspondence, regularly alternated with lectures, experiments, business, and social obligations; and it is sometimes difficult to say which received the closest and most constant attention.

It is pleasant to observe in the midst of these engrossing labours, a not unfrequent recurrence to higher and more spiritual considerations; and we think we can sometimes trace a sort of secret link between the daily trial and the evening meditation. After a weary day, spent in thankless efforts to do good, how touching is the following record!—‘Still under depression; my little stock of faith almost exhausted; and yet I can humbly say, in the multitude of things which harass my mind, the main object is the good of others; for this I have in great measure given up my own gratification, for if instead of these things my time were devoted to philosophical pursuits and experiments, to which I am naturally so prone, the path to honour and distinction stands fair before me. May the sacrifice be accepted above!’ We could almost imagine, on reading these lines, that the voice of his mother was even then sounding in his ears the tender appeal—‘Come, my beloved, if a right hand or a right eye be called for, give it up. The Lord loves a cheerful giver, and he will restore thee an hundred fold.’

The deep personal attachment which subsisted between the parties engaged in the propagation of Lancaster’s plans was both

singular and sustaining. Fox writes to Allen, 'Let us cheer each other, we shall reap if we faint not. In the whole of the struggle my mind has been supported by a consciousness of the close fellowship of heart which was ever to be found in you, and I hope that so long as we are spared in this present sphere of action we shall be like Jonathan and David.' Allen notes, 'Dear Fox and I traced the gracious support of Divine providence under the work, and were comforted.' In writing to him, he says, 'No great and important object was ever attained without considerable exertion, but when we are associated with those we love, as I firmly believe is the case in the present instance, we may, perhaps, adopt the lines of Cowper:—

' And one in heart, in purpose, and design,  
Gird up each other to the race Divine.'

So, in writing to Joseph Foster, an excellent man to whom he was united by the strongest ties of personal regard, and the value of whose long continued labours in the school cause, it would be impossible to over estimate, he says, 'I have often been very thankful in having such a coadjutor as thou art. I do not think we have entered into the work altogether in our own will, and humbly trust that we may be made instrumental in doing much good.'

School affairs at this crisis, brought Mr. Allen into almost constant communication with members of the royal family, and other distinguished persons. Among these, His Royal Highness the late Duke of Kent, and the late Duke of Bedford, afterwards President of the British and Foreign School Society, stand pre-eminent, on account of the laborious personal attention they gave to the affairs of the institution. The acquaintance with the Duke of Kent thus commenced, eventually ripened into mutual and sincere regard. His Royal Highness frequently consulted Mr. Allen confidentially in relation to his own personal affairs, treated him as an attached friend, and subsequently induced him to act officially on his behalf. The duke's grateful sense of his services was from time to time expressed in very gratifying terms.

The general peace of the year 1814, brought the allied sovereigns on a visit to London, when the Society of Friends hastened to present addresses to the Emperor of Russia and to the King of Prussia. That for the Emperor of Russia, was left with Count Lieven, on the 18th of June, and the next day William Allen called to arrange for its reception. To his surprise, however, instead of obtaining a formal interview, he found the Count in his carriage, who bade him get in, and, driving off

immediately, informed him that the emperor wished to attend a Friends' meeting, and that there was no time for it but the present.

Calling at Count Nesselrode's for the Emperor, the Grand Duchess of Oldenburgh, the Duke of Oldenburgh, and the Duke of Wurtemburg, the whole party drove off, without the slightest previous intimation, to the nearest meeting-house then open. No commotion was excited by their arrival. They were quietly shewn to the seats usually occupied by men and women respectively. The meeting remained in silence about a quarter of an hour, 'in which time,' says Mr. Allen, 'my mind was sweetly calmed and refreshed, in the firm belief that the Great Master had the work in his own hands.' Richard Phillips then stood up, with a short but acceptable address to the meeting; and soon after, John Wilkinson was engaged in explaining the effects of vital religion and the nature of true worship. After he sat down, John Bell uttered a few sentences, and John Wilkinson concluded in supplication. The Emperor and the whole party conducted themselves with great seriousness; and 'after meeting' they kindly shook hands with the Friends, and departed.

Two days after this, the emperor received Mr. Allen and the deputation, with the 'Friends' address. The number was very limited, in accordance with Count Lieven's instructions. Alexander received them alone, and conversed freely with them in English; asking questions which 'evidently shewed that he was acquainted with the operations of the Holy Spirit in the soul.' He said he 'agreed entirely with Friends on the subject of worship.' He told them that he was himself in the habit of daily prayer, that at first he employed a form of words, but at length grew uneasy in so doing, as the words were not always applicable to the present state of his mind, and that 'now the subject of his prayer was according to the impression he felt of his wants at the time.' He stated how 'the Lord had made him acquainted with spiritual religion,' after which he had much sought it, and that 'herein he found strength and consolation'; adding that he, and 'all of us, were only placed in this life to glorify God and to be useful to one another.' During the interview, he repeatedly pressed their hands, expressed a wish to know more of them, said he should like to see a Friend's house, and concluded by observing, that if any Friends should visit Petersburg on a religious account, they were not to wait for any introduction, but to come direct to him, and he would do everything to promote their views.

The 'wish to see a Friend's house' was not forgotten. When at Portsmouth he again reverted to it, and arrangements were made for John Glaisyer, of Brighton, to receive him. But

when he reached that town, the crowd was so great that he was obliged to proceed without fulfilling his intentions. Passing a farm house, a few miles from Lewes, however, he observed two persons standing at their own gate, who, by their appearance, he supposed to be Friends. He immediately ordered the driver to stop, alighted, inquired if they were of the people called Quakers, and, being answered in the affirmative, asked permission to go into the house. The request, although considered exceedingly strange and unaccountable, for these parties had not heard any thing of the emperor's interest in Friends, was of course cheerfully complied with. The duchess then alighted, and they all went in together. After a little time, the duchess asked if they might go over the house, and they were accordingly conducted into the principal apartments, the neatness of which they praised. On returning to the parlour, they were invited to take some refreshments, which they did, and seemed pleased with the attention. Finding that the family had not heard of the emperor having had any communication with 'Friends' in London, he gave them an account of his having been 'at meeting.' At parting, the emperor saluted the hand of the lady, and the duchess kissed her. They then both shook hands cordially with her husband, (Nathaniel Rickman) and bade them 'farewell.'

At what precise period William Allen first began to speak 'in ministry,' does not appear. It would seem, however, not to have been before the year 1818. But, although at first unemployed officially, his attention to the claims of the religious society with which he was connected, had from his earliest years, and during his busiest seasons, been most exemplary. In 1799, we find him appointed a corresponding member\* of the 'Meeting for Sufferings,' for Derby and Nottinghamshire.

In 1811, he is set apart to the station of 'overseer.'† 'I am

\* The yearly meeting of London, in 1675, appointed a meeting to be held in that city, for the purpose of advising and assisting Friends in cases of suffering for conscience sake. It is composed of men Friends, under the name of correspondents, chosen by the several quarterly meetings. Approved ministers are also members. It was called the Meeting for Sufferings, in consequence of its original purpose. It is considered as a standing committee of the yearly meeting, and to its care is intrusted whatever may arise during the intervals of that meeting, affecting the society, or requiring immediate attention.

† The discipline of the Society of Friends directs that, if practicable, some of their members, whose conduct and conversation manifest 'the fruits of the Spirit,' be appointed to exercise a general care and oversight of all the individuals who constitute the particular meeting to which they belong. The persons thus appointed are denominated *Overseers*.

afraid to refuse,' he says, 'lest I should shrink from a duty, and thereby bring greater spiritual poverty upon myself. My prayer is to be preserved from doing any harm, if I can do no good.' In 1813, he is chosen 'an elder,' and the year following he is 'constrained to utter' a few words, 'which humbled him exceedingly.' In 1818, he seems to have been recognised as an approved minister among Friends, and in that character to have visited the families of his district. On Thursday, the 11th of May, 1820, 'in solemn conference,' he was 'discharged from the office of elder,' and 'recorded as a minister in unity.' It was *as a minister*, and 'under religious concern,' that he subsequently undertook those various and important journeys, the records of which form so large a portion of the volumes before us. We can do little more than enumerate the places thus visited.

The *first* journey, undertaken in 1816, was in some respects an exception to the statement we have made, inasmuch as on this occasion he seems to have travelled chiefly in the capacity of 'care-taker' to some women friends, whose 'concern' the journey properly was. They crossed to Calais, and then proceeded through Belgium and Holland to Pyrmont, Hesse Cassell, Frankfort, Strasburg, and Basle; everywhere inspecting prisons, schools, and public institutions generally.

Fellenberg, whom they saw at Hoffwyll, is described as 'a man whose countenance and manner strikingly indicates great mental power, openness of character, and benignity.' Soon afterwards they visited Pestalozzi. 'The lively old man,' says Mr. Allen, 'saluted me with two kisses, one on each cheek. He is rather below the middle stature, and thin. A spirit of harmony seemed to pervade the whole establishment. I was much pleased.'

At Geneva Mr. Allen was again plunged in sorrow by the decease of his second wife, Charlotte Hanbury, to whom he was affectionately attached. She was interred in the cemetery at Sacconet, and soon after the party returned home.

The *second* and most important journey occupied him from August 1818 to February 1820, and embraced Northern Europe, with some portions of Turkey, Greece, and Malta.

Accompanied by his friend, Stephen Grellet,\* Mr. Allen sailed from Harwich, on the 15th of August, for Stavanger, in Norway. On the 25th they were approaching the coast, and ranges of high and rugged rocks one beyond the other presented themselves. Here they landed and established 'a system of disci-

\* An eminent minister of the Society of Friends; a native of France, but resident at Burlington, U. S.

pline' among some of the inhabitants who recognise the religious principles of the Society of Friends.

The voyage to Christiansand was very tedious; the wind boisterous and contrary, the country 'a picture of desolation.' The land journey to Christiania was arduous and fatiguing, sometimes 'beaten by the roads,' six horses could not force along the carriage. On one occasion men and horses are alike 'used up,' obliged to pass the night by the roadside, 'the face of the country resembling *waves* ;' in fact 'huge masses of rock from two hundred to five hundred feet high mostly covered with pines, and in constant succession.' Finally, the 'roads improve,' and the 'country becomes beautiful, resembling Switzerland.'

Proceeding to Stockholm the two Friends had an interview with the King of Sweden, to whom they presented an address on prison discipline, education, the management of the poor, and religious liberty. They were afterwards admitted to a private conference, and in about an hour obtained all the privileges they wished for 'Friends' in Norway and Sweden. The king was most kind and cordial. 'While I was holding his hand to take leave,' says Mr. Allen, 'in the love which I felt for him I expressed my desire that the Lord would bless and preserve him. It seemed to go to his heart, and he presented his cheek for me to kiss, first one, then the other; he took the same leave of Stephen and Enoch (a Norwegian) and commended himself to our prayers.'

Soon after this interview they embarked for Finland. The prison at Abo was found in sad condition, and notes were made which led to the speedy removal of the evils complained of. While at Abo they dined with a large party at the archbishop's. At 'the pause' after dinner, Grellet gave a religious address, and they separated under a mutual feeling of regard and esteem.

On the 12th of November the travellers arrived at the outposts of Pittsburgh, the snow everywhere on the ground, and the roads rough. Here they found Walter Venning, Dr. Patterson, and many other friends, to cheer and welcome them.

Their first formal visit (the emperor being absent) was to Prince Alexander Galitzin; then to Lord Cathcart; and afterwards to the Princess Sophia Mestchersky. Everybody received them gladly. The Lord set before them 'an open door.' Mr. Allen describes his visits to the Princess Sophia as visits to 'a sister and dear Christian friend.' She conversed without the least restraint on religious subjects, and gave evidence of true piety and deep understanding. The following description is

given of the interior of her palace, in the depth of a Russian winter :—

' The large room has a very lofty ceiling and is just like a shrubbery. There are some fine tall trees in boxes, and very pretty trellis-work, covered with a beautiful creeper from New Holland ; the plants are all evergreens, and in a healthy flourishing state ; among them are cages of singing-birds, some of which are of magnificent plumage, and there was one elegant pair of Indian sparrows. Their stoves, and their universal system of double windows keep up a uniform and very agreeable temperature throughout all the apartments, and even passages of a Russian house. The princess's apartment is so large, and so much divided by shrubs and trellis-work, that two or three parties might converse at the same time without interrupting each other.'

Dining with the minister of the interior at a large party, Papof, the confidential secretary of Prince Galitzin, sat next to Mr. Allen, and entered freely into religious conversation. Papof talked like 'an experienced Christian.' He 'spoke feelingly of seasons of desertion and dryness, in which he said that all he could do was to come to the Saviour with the appeal, 'Thou knowest that I love thee. If I perish, I perish, but it shall be at thy feet. I have no hope but in thee, and if thou wilt not look upon me any more, I must still love thee.' But then he sweetly remarked, that after these deep trials the light of the Lord's countenance shone upon him again, and he went on his way, rejoicing.'

Prince Galitzin, himself, was not less sensible of the necessity and value of experimental piety. He repeatedly sent for the two strangers, entered into their plans, urged them to communicate freely with him at all times, and sometimes united with them in prayer for the Divine blessing upon their labours. Michael, the metropolitan of the Greek church, who received them 'in a robe of purple silk, ornamented with stars, and a cap enriched by a cross set in diamonds,' kept them in conversation at the monastery for four hours, and chiefly on religious subjects. He professed his belief, that through the teaching of the Holy Spirit alone, could men come to a knowledge of the truth, and he finally parted with them as the best of friends. Everywhere there appeared to be a disposition to promote religion, and to countenance benevolent effort for the poor.

The public institutions in St. Petersburg were found to be generally 'well managed ;' the Lunatic Asylum 'a superb establishment ;' and the large Hospital distinguished 'for general neatness and cleanliness,' to a degree rarely equalled, never sur-

passed. The military schools, then but recently established, were in a good state of discipline, but very deficient in lessons for instruction. Some were taken from infidel writers of the French school; others of better character, were ill-arranged and unsuitable. Mr. Allen at once perceived the vast importance of promoting the extension of education in Russia, and of substituting in place of useless or absolutely mischievous compilations, a volume of selections from the Holy Scriptures; and to the accomplishment of this object he devoted himself with characteristic energy. The opposition he met with was great; and it arose in quarters where it might least have been expected.

Frequently had he to combat the argument so often refuted, that learning, being an instrument of power, should be kept from the poor lest they should make a bad use of it. Again and again had he to show, that the ground taken by the opponents of popular instruction was fatal to the progress of all civilization; and times without number, had he to urge the inconsistency of looking for good from the circulation of the Scriptures among the people, while thirty millions of them were unable to read a single letter. The determination of the emperor, always in advance of those who surrounded him, at length settled the question, and the work was commenced without an hour's subsequent delay. Dr. Paterson, the two Vennings, and Mr. Swan, of the London Missionary Society, assisted in the compilation, and with Mr. Allen, 'literally worked at it night and day.' In rather more than a fortnight they had the book ready to lay before the emperor, who was so delighted with it that he immediately ordered 8,000 roubles (£1,400.) to be paid for an edition. This volume was soon after translated into Modern Greek, French, and Italian; and in the English form has ever since been the selection used in all the schools of the British and Foreign School Society.

The conduct of the emperor, on his return to the capital, was in perfect harmony with his professions when in England. He received his visitors without ceremony; conversed with them in the openness of friendship; asked for notes of all they had seen; knelt down and united with them in prayer; and at parting, kissed their hands in token of affectionate esteem. In the course of conversation he told them 'how early he had been favoured with touches of Divine love in his mind,' though 'he did not know from whence they came,' and was at the time 'surrounded by persons entirely ignorant of these things;' how 'he and his brother Constantine, with whom he slept, used to pray extempore and had comfort in it;' how 'these impressions were dissipated;' how 'he had imbibed French principles;' and how, in 1812, 'he had for the first time read the Bible,' recognized 'the witness it bore to the operations of the Holy Spirit

in his soul,' and 'found peace' in believing. Prince Galitzin, with equal frankness, described his own religious course; how he was brought to see the emptiness of mere forms, and the inestimable value of true Christianity. He said the emperor and himself had been brought up as playfellows together, and were exposed to the same disadvantages, in being surrounded by irreligious persons. He told them that the emperor took his Bible with him in the campaign of 1812, and read in it every day. He also gave them many interesting details about the Holy Alliance,\* and the astonishment of the emperor's own court when they heard the decree read. But into these matters we have no room to enter.

Cheered and refreshed as Mr. Allen must naturally have been by much that he saw in Petersburg, his residence there was far from being agreeable, in consequence of the great depression of mind to which he was at this period subject. He frequently speaks of himself as 'in mental bonds,' as 'deeply tried in spirit,' 'needing much faith to remain,' feeling as it were 'shut up in prison,' longing for home, and so on. Expressions of this character are frequent in the journal. The 'nicely warmed rooms' only make him think of his mother, and wish she could have her house made equally comfortable; and letters from his daughter can scarcely be read, for tears. 'Thou art my beloved child,' he writes to her, 'doubly dear to me, dear by the closest ties of nature, and even still dearer by that precious union of spirit which is produced by religious feeling. I am sometimes obliged to wipe my eyes, in order to get on with reading thy letters.' His valued friend and companion, Mr. Grellet, was at these seasons a great comfort to him, strengthening him after the labours of the day, both by conversation and prayer. On one of these evenings, when they had been undisturbed by visitors, he says, 'After supper, dear Stephen and I had some very edifying conversation; my mind was low and tender, and after we had sat some time, he engaged in supplication. On taking leave to retire to my own room I

\* A copy is preserved amongst William Allen's manuscripts of the manifesto which announces what has been denominated the 'Holy Alliance,' published at Petersburg, under date, 'January 10th, 1816,' which expresses the determination of the Emperor Alexander, and that of his allies, the Emperor of Austria, and the King of Prussia, to 'endeavour to regulate their future conduct by the principles of the gospel.' It also declares their conviction, that the Christian nations, of which they and their people form a part, have, in reality, no other sovereign than Him to whom alone power really belongs, God, our Divine Saviour. They, therefore, recommend to their people, with the most tender solicitude, as the sole means of enjoying that peace which alone is durable, to strengthen themselves every day, more and more, in the principles, and in the exercise of the duties, which the Divine Saviour has taught mankind.

remarked, ‘The Master has been kind to us this evening; let us repose in his love.’ Fearing the Lord, they ‘spake often one to another, and the Lord hearkened and heard,’ and gave them peace.

In March, 1819, the travellers, after suitably acknowledging the great kindness they had received from Lord and Lady Cathcart, and Sir John Wylie, took leave of the Vennings and their other beloved friends, and finally left Petersburgh for Odessa and Constantinople, by way of Moscow. Travelling onwards, with three horses in the kabitska, or sledge; the course of the road shown only by branches of pine, stuck in at certain distances; the snow drifting and covering holes of above four feet deep, into which they often plumped without the slightest warning; sometimes, as at Novorogod, sleeping on a wolf-skin, for Russian landlords then provided no beds; sometimes obliged to pull up, and lie quietly by the road side till break of day; they at length reached Tver in safety. At this place, where they had letters to the governor, they remained a few days visiting prisons, and seeking to promote education. ‘It has been a portion of our duty here,’ says Mr. Allen, ‘as in other places, to visit and to enter into feeling with the afflicted, and with the outcasts of society, by which our spirits have been much depressed; our service leads us to dungeons as well as to palaces, and we feel the force of those words of the apostle, ‘We are debtors to all men.’ It is a consolation, however, to know that this trial of our feelings is not in vain, and that our representations to the proper authorities *have* proved the means of alleviating much human misery.’

From Tver they proceeded to Moscow, where similar engagements presented themselves. The public institutions, chiefly through the zeal and energy of the empress-mother, were in admirable order. Of this extraordinary woman, Mr. Allen says, and he is not given to extravagance, ‘I have not heard of any woman in the world, who is so heartily, so incessantly, and so extensively engaged in works of benevolence as the worthy mother of the good Alexander.’ From Moscow a report was forwarded to the emperor, containing observations on what they had seen, and suggestions calculated to promote the great objects of their journey.

By the end of April they had left Moscow, and were on their way over the Steppes of Tartary, to visit the German Colonies of Mennonites on the banks of the Dnieper. It is pleasant to find that as they journeyed they observed, and not unfrequently in the villages, the women, neatly dressed, collected before their cottages in little groups, singing; and, whatever may be the disadvantages of Russian rule, it is satisfactory to learn that it

rarely, if ever, happens that any body is starved. For a single penny, a peasant can obtain as much black bread as he can eat.

On their arrival at the Colonies they were very warmly received by General Contineas, the military superintendent, a sensible and religious man, who kindly undertook to interpret for them at their religious meetings. This believing centurion, after their return to England, opened a correspondence with Mr. Allen, which was continued until his death, in 1830.

After leaving the Colonies they proceeded to Simferopol, to visit the 'Malakans, or Spiritual Christians.' Many of these had suffered persecution in consequence of their separation from the Greek church, and many, particularly the Cossacks, languished for a long time in prison. They, however, firmly maintained their ground. They prefer the Holy Scriptures to all other writings, considering them as the rule of their faith, and as containing the revealed will of God to man. Though not rich, they have paid as much as seventy roubles, (upwards of £13.) for a copy of the sacred volume. They acknowledge Christ as 'God manifest in the flesh,' who died on the cross for the sins of the world. They reject pictures or images, and the adoration of saints. In their assemblies the Bible is read and explained. Yet,—such is man, everywhere the same,—'though most of them love the truth,' they divide and separate on unimportant points, forgetting that love which is 'the fulfilling of the law.' With these people the two Friends held meetings, and, through an interpreter, exhorted and instructed them. From hence they proceeded through Cherson to Odessa, where they embarked for Constantinople.

On the 1st of August they sailed by the boat for Scio (then the most prosperous portion of Greece), and on the third day, about nine in the morning, came in sight of the island. The visit was a satisfactory one; the Greek archbishop consenting to become the president of a school society, and Professor Bambas undertaking to translate and print the scripture lessons. On the 14th they hired a boat to take them to Athens, and endured many privations and perils during a protracted voyage of eleven days. Here they were refreshed by the voice and welcome of Dr. Pinkerton. They remained a fortnight, doing what they could, and then set out for Corinth. From hence they proceeded to Patras and Zante, where, after a short quarantine they landed, and were heartily welcomed by Colonel (now Major-General Sir Patrick) Ross. Here Mr. Allen was attacked by fever, and, during a severe and dangerous illness of some weeks, received attentions from Colonel Ross and his lady, whose kindness he even after spoke of with love and gratitude.

A sincere attachment to him was cherished by the colonel ; and a beautiful letter addressed by the daughter of Sir Patrick, twenty-five years afterwards, to one of the editors, describes the deep feeling with which he heard of his friend's decease.

After visiting Corfu and Malta, and subsequently Rome, Milan, Geneva, and Paris, Mr. Allen arrived at home on the 26th of February, 1820, having been absent about a year and a half.

The *third* journey was to Vienna and Verona in 1822, and was undertaken chiefly for the purpose of again meeting the Emperor of Russia, and endeavouring to interest him in the cause of the poor Greeks, and in the abolition of slavery. He reached Vienna on the 27th of September, and was immediately sent for by Alexander. The interview was long and satisfactory ; the emperor encouraged him to speak freely ; and in succession, the German colonies, schools, the slave-trade, and the condition of the Greeks were severally discussed. During a second visit the emperor urged him to go to Verona, where he again met him twice, and entered fully and warmly into his various benevolent projects. In the course of these interviews, entire hours were occupied in religious conversation and in social worship. The emperor spoke much of trials known only to himself and God ; of temptations under which he could find no relief except in the promise, ‘My grace is sufficient for thee ;’ and of sorrows which drove him continually to a throne of grace. After these conversations they sat in silence, prayed, and parted. On the 31st of October, Mr. Allen waited upon him to take leave. After describing a lengthened conversation he adds, ‘It was now between nine and ten o’clock, but we seemed loth to part. When I rose, he embraced and kissed me three times, saying, ‘Remember me to your family, I should like to know them.’ Ah ! when and where shall we meet again !’ They never saw each other more ; the death of Alexander, which took place in 1825, putting an end to this singular friendship between a Russian emperor and an English tradesman, a powerful despot and a plain Friend.

During Mr. Allen’s stay at Verona, Prince Esterhazy, the Crown Prince of Sweden, and the Duke of Wellington, all treated him with the greatest kindness and attention. The duke, who seems to have entertained a sincere respect for his character, asked him to dinner, to meet some of the eminent persons then assembled at the Congress ; but Mr. Allen, with characteristic humility, declined the invitation, stating that ‘where duty did not call, he believed it was his place rather to remain in the shade.’ The duke, who saw at a glance his reasons for refusing, imme-

diately told him with similar frankness, that he believed he was right. In following years Mr. Allen several times records with satisfaction 'the noble conduct' of the Duke of Wellington, to whom, as well as to Mr. Canning and Earl Bathurst, he always felt under deep personal obligations.

Leaving Verona, he next proceeded to Turin, where he found the British minister had just received instructions from Mr. Canning to report to the Duke of Wellington, then at Verona, on the state of the Waldenses, who were at that time exposed to severe persecution. It was soon agreed that the secretary should accompany him on a visit to the valleys. On their return to Turin, Mr. Allen addressed a letter, containing the substance of his observations, to the Emperor of Russia. The British minister accompanied it by a note to the Duke of Wellington, and a special courier was despatched with the documents. The result was important to the poor Waldenses, as they obtained by this means some important privileges. The letter to Alexander was forwarded to him as soon as the courier arrived. The emperor was out. On returning late at night he read it; Baron Wylie found him at two o'clock in the morning, sitting over it in tears.

Proceeding through Geneva,—where he met the Baron de Stael, and the Duke and Duchess de Broglie,—he passed on to Stuttgard, and obtained an interview with the king of Wurtemberg, to whom he was introduced by the Emperor of Russia. 'My visit to the Waldenses,' he says, 'naturally opened the way for conversation upon toleration in matters of religion. I remarked, in substance, that the business of civil governors was the protection of the people in their rights and privileges, but that they had nothing to do in matters of religion, provided that the good order of the community was not disturbed.' Both the king and queen fully assented to this doctrine. 'I had, then,' he adds, 'under the influence of duty, to make some remarks on the subject of religion, which appeared to be felt; and we parted, I believe, under mutual feelings of Christian regard and affection. They cordially took me by the hand, and the king said, that if there was anything in which he could gratify me at Stuttgard, he should be glad to do it.' This audience occupied from an hour-and-a-half to two hours. From Stuttgard, after paying a brief visit to the Pastor Oberlin, at Waldbach, he proceeded to Paris, and thence home.

The *fourth* journey, in 1832, embraced Holland, Hanover, Prussia, and Hungary. The *fifth* and last, in 1833, included Spain and the Pyrenees. We say the last, because the continental tours of 1839 and 1840 were unimportant. In all these engagements, facilities were continually presented for exercising

influence. The Crown Prince of Prussia, the King of Bavaria, the Grand Duke and Duchess of Weimar, Prince Esterhazy, even the King and Queen of Spain received him with cordiality, and expressed their willingness to forward his views. Everywhere he urged the rights of conscience, and pressed the importance of encouraging the formation of committees of pious and benevolent persons, to keep up a constant system of visiting the prisons, and reading the Holy Scriptures; laying it down as a great general principle, that measures for reclaiming could never be carried into full effect, but by persons who are themselves under the influence of Christian principle. Everywhere he sought to impress the advantages likely to result from the union of individuals in works of benevolence. A paper he drew up on this subject, when in Russia, embodies views at once sound and comprehensive, urges the beneficial influence which the higher ranks of society may exert in forming the minds and characters of the poor, and suggests the importance of creating and fostering a powerful and instructed middle class.

During the intervals which elapsed between these journeys, the ordinary employments of his busy life were pursued with the same intensity as ever. But they were now frequently enlivened by visitors from foreign parts. His house was almost always the home of some pilgrim from afar. Having himself met with much kindness abroad, he conscientiously improved the many opportunities afforded in the metropolis for showing hospitality to the stranger. Francis Martin, of Bourdeaux, (now minister of the French church in London \*), and Emilien Frossard, of Montauban; Charles Vernet, of Geneva, and Alexander D'Junkovsky, of St. Petersburgh, all write to him with something like filial affection; delighting to call to mind his counsels, and congratulating themselves on having lived under his roof. With others whom he had known in distant lands, he maintained a pleasant correspondence. Mariamne Vernet, of Geneva,—a deeply-tried, but most excellent woman,—her daughter, the Baroness de Stael; the family of M. Courtois, of Toulouse, and Professor Tholuck, of Halle, all wrote to him, occasionally, as to a Christian friend.

\* During the 'hundred days,' this gentleman was working incessantly at Paris, in the establishment of schools of scriptural instruction, on the plan of the British and Foreign School Society. Napoleon had issued orders for such schools to be called into existence with all possible dispatch, and Mr. Martin was in the *bureau* of M. Carnot, both overcome with fatigue, when the news of the battle of Waterloo put a stop to their labours. The returning Bourbons had no sympathy with the movement.

In 1823, he lost his only child, and was deeply afflicted by the event. ‘When thinking,’ he says, ‘of the probability of my dearest earthly treasure, in whom my tenderest affections were concentrated, being taken from me, I have prayed in an agony, and with many tears, that such a cup might pass from me; nevertheless, I dared only ask it in conformity with the Divine will.’ When she died, he was enabled to say, ‘The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away, blessed be the name of the Lord.’ The Princess Sophia Mestchersky, Prince Galitzin, and other friends, sent him, on this occasion, letters of condolence, which prove how near he was to the hearts of the pious writers.

Two years before the event just alluded to, he mentions ‘seriously thinking of giving up Guy’s, in order to be more at liberty to serve the Great Master;’ but the treasurer was so ‘earnest’ for his continuance, that he ‘could not well get at liberty.’ His lectures were still crowded with students, and his energy in delivering them was unabated. It was not till the year 1826, that he finally retired from the hospital, closing his connexion with it by an address to the students, which was printed, and widely circulated. In all his lectures, Mr. Allen had felt it right to urge the claims of revelation, and to avail himself of every suitable opportunity for directing the minds of his hearers to the Great Source of all wisdom and goodness; in *this*, he enlarges on the Divine justice, impressively urges the responsibility of man, and points to the compassion of God, as having provided ‘in the person of the Redeemer for reconciliation with himself.’ ‘Can I,’ he says, ‘when speaking of the goodness so evidently displayed in the material world, forbear to advert to that greatest of blessings, which in his infinite love he has bestowed upon us by the coming of the Son of God in the flesh? Ought I to refrain from speaking out boldly upon subjects of such unspeakable importance? I know that the views which I take are, unhappily, in some quarters not very fashionable; that they are even humiliating to that philosophical pride, which spurns at everything beyond the comprehension of its limited capacity; but how far this is just, or reasonable, or really philosophical, we shall presently examine.’ And then he proceeds with his argument.

The same year that saw him retire from Guy’s, witnessed his anxious endeavours to free himself from another engagement, still more complicated and responsible. We refer to his connexion with Lanark.

In the year 1813, Robert Owen, then distinguished only for his benevolence, and especially honoured for the zeal and energy with which he had sought to ameliorate the condition

of the labouring and manufacturing poor, came to London, in consequence of some business arrangements, which involved the sale of the Lanark Mills. The importance of continuing the plans then in progress, for preserving the morals and promoting the comfort and happiness of the work-people, was strongly felt by Mr. Allen; and, ‘after much conflict of mind,’ ‘yielding to the pressing solicitations’ of beloved friends, who ‘secured’ him ‘from loss for one year,’ and engaged to take his shares, if he subsequently ‘felt uneasy,’ he became a partner in the concern. The articles of partnership indicate the views and feelings of the proprietors. They provided, by distinct agreement, for the religious education of all the children of the labourers employed in the works; and it is expressly stated, ‘that nothing shall be introduced tending to disparage the Christian religion, or undervalue the authority of the Holy Scriptures,—‘that no books shall be introduced into the library until they have first been approved of at a general meeting of the partners,—and ‘that children shall not be employed in the mills until they shall be of such an age as that the labour shall not be prejudicial to their health.’ The year following, Mr. Allen visited Lanark, ‘found the arrangements with regard to the manufacturing part excellent, and even beyond expectation,’ but he adds, ‘alas! Owen, with all his cleverness and benevolence, wants the *one thing*, without which, parts and acquirements and benevolence are unavailing.’ The ‘painful conversations’ he now had with Mr. Owen greatly depressed him; he could only find comfort in the thought, that all the other partners were, like himself, determined that Mr. Owen’s views should not affect the instruction of the work-people. He speaks of ‘a heavy parting’ at Braxfield, for Owen was kindness itself.

Mr. Allen was now anxious to avoid the partnership, for the deed was not yet executed; but the reflection, that ‘it would not be generous to desert some of the other parties,—the wide field of usefulness afforded by the control of three thousand people,—the opportunity it gave of successfully opposing ‘infidel plans,’—above all, the ‘sense of duty felt in the engagement,’ after prayers put up, night and day, that, if it were a wrong thing, some timely check might be felt,—decided him; and he felt peace in leaving the result in the hands of Infinite Wisdom.

As might have been expected, this connexion was a source of perpetual uneasiness and anxiety. Owen published his plans in the newspapers, and appeared, more or less, to identify his partners with himself. Allen was alternately vexed, grieved, and desponding. Long and excellent letters, conversations, entreaties—all were in vain. The once promising, and still

amiable son-in-law of David Dale, had become an avowed and determined infidel. With unwearied patience, Mr. Allen clung to the hope of winning him back again to the truth, and continued to receive him, when in London, as a guest. His apostolic mother, kindling with indignation when he appeared at her son's house, refused to remain in the same room with the denier of her Lord, and fled from his presence with grief and shame.

In the year 1818, fresh rumours of infidelity at Lanark reached London, and the partners at once determined to visit the mills, to spend a week or two among the people, and to ascertain, by strict personal investigation and inquiry, whether Mr. Owen's opinions had, or had not, spread amongst them. The visit, to a great extent, relieved their anxieties. They ascertained from the ministers in the neighbourhood that sceptical opinions had taken no root among the population,—they received very favourable accounts of the morals of the people,—and were delighted to discover in the general superintendent of the works, a truly religious man. They also found a Bible Society established, to which both Mr. Owen and his family subscribed. Before they left, the people were called together; an admirable address, which was afterwards printed, and freely circulated among them, was delivered by Mr. Allen, and a deputation from the people expressed their gratitude.

In 1822, fresh difficulties arose. Owen came to London with new schemes, and unabated, if not increased, hostility to revelation. Mr. Allen speaks of himself as being 'rendered miserable,'—makes up his mind 'to have no more discussions with Robert Owen, that being clearly a waste of time,' and again meditates withdrawing from the concern. Another visit of inspection now took place, followed by a kind and earnest letter to Owen, praying *for* him, but determining to part *from* him; an event, which, deferred from time to time by difficulties incident to the disposal of so large a concern, was at length, in 1828, happily accomplished.

Freed from the anxieties and cares of Lanark, Mr. Allen's mind, never at rest, turned with new interest to the condition of the agricultural population. As early as 1823, he is recording thoughts, as to the best method of 'making an inroad upon the present demoralizing system of paying agricultural labourers out of the poor's-rate, by building cottages for them, and giving them some land'; and, in 1824, we find him, while lodging at Brighton, going over to Lindfield to procure ground for the establishment of a school of industry. In 1825, he erected commodious school-rooms for boys, girls, and infants, with

workshops adjoining. To these schools, in which three teachers were employed, lending libraries were attached. Some of the elder boys were engaged, during a portion of the day, on the school-farm, under a skilful husbandman; some in a printing-office, and others in different works of manual labour. The girls were taught needle-work and knitting, and the infants learnt to make patch-work, and to plait straw.

Soon after the establishment of these schools, an old friend of Mr. Allen's, the late John Smith, M.P., of Dale Park, visited the place, and, approving the object, purchased the estate of Graveley, consisting of about a hundred acres, in the immediate neighbourhood of Lindfield, and subsequently built upon it eighteen cottages for labourers, with an acre-and-a-quarter of land to each. Seven other cottages, with from five to six acres each, were also erected, and a small house as an occasional residence for Mr. Allen. Here he spent no inconsiderable portion of his later years. It was his favourite retreat, the chosen spot to which he always retired when fatigued with the bustle and business of London. Here, too, he enjoyed a longer period of domestic felicity than had been his lot during any portion of his previous history. After the decease of his daughter, in 1827, he became, for the third time, a married man, uniting himself with Mrs. Birkbeck, a widow lady, of the Society of Friends, with whom he had long been on terms of intimate friendship. This union, which proved a very happy one, lasted for eight years, when it was terminated by her death, which took place in 1835.

A pamphlet 'on the manner of cultivating different articles, with directions for the rotation of crops,' which he published here, under the title of 'Colonies at Home,' has passed through several editions; and another, 'On the Means of Diminishing the Poor's Rate,' was favourably received at the time of its appearance. A 'cottage society,' which he succeeded in establishing, and which was afterwards entitled 'The Society for Improving the Condition of the Labouring Classes,' also effected much good. After long-continued effort, and many a struggle with prejudice and supineness, his persevering exertions at length produced an obvious effect upon the habits of the people. The appearance of the children became more orderly and respectable; the dwellings of the cottagers presented comforts to which the poor man had hitherto been a stranger; and many were withdrawn from dependence on the parish, in consequence of the allotment of land enabling them to provide for their families by their own industry. The Duke of Sussex, the Earl of Chichester, Lord Brougham, Lord John Russell, and many other noblemen and gentlemen, visited him at the cottage, and

expressed their interest in his plans. Mr. Allen himself always regarded the experiment at Lindfield as being, in an economical view, a successful one. Many of his most judicious friends considered it to be, in that aspect, a failure. The true state of things may probably be gathered from two very significant lines in his journal, under date of October 29, 1834. ‘I leave Lindfield,’ he says, ‘*this time* with a pleasing conviction that all the tenants are *in a way* to pay their rents.’ Whether they did actually pay them, is not recorded. We doubt not that, under any circumstances, their slumbers were undisturbed by dread of ejection or distress warrant. When told that he was too sanguine and too enthusiastic, his reply was, ‘It is very possible that I am too sanguine. I remember what Charles James Fox said in the House of Commons, when the friends of the slave-merchants within those walls charged the abolitionists with enthusiasm—turning to the Speaker he exclaimed, ‘Enthusiasm, sir! why, there never was any good done in the world without enthusiasm.’ We must feel warm upon our projects, otherwise, from the discouragements we are sure to meet with here, they will drop through.’

In the different visits Mr. Allen paid to Scotland and Ireland, during which he became acquainted with Professors Playfair and Jardine, Sir George Mackenzie, Lord Jeffrey, Dr. Chalmers, Leonard Horner, Dr. Brewster, Mrs. Brunton, Maria Edgeworth, and other eminent persons; he zealously sought to promote his favourite plans, sometimes overlooking their want of adaptation to the people. The following amusing, yet melancholy description of Irish impracticability, by Miss Edgeworth, is too good to be omitted:—

‘ Your plans of improved agriculture and economy appear most feasible and most promising on paper; but I fear that, in attempting to carry them into execution in this country, there would be found obstacles of which you can form no estimate, without a more intimate knowledge of the habits of the peasantry of Ireland, than a *first* visit to this country could afford, or, in short, anything but long residence could give. Their want of habits of punctuality and order, would embarrass you at every step, and prevent your carrying into effect those regular plans in which it is *essential* that they must join, for their own advantage. Your *dairy plans*, for instance, which have succeeded so well in Switzerland, would not do in this country, at least, not without a century’s experiments. Paddy would *fall* to disputing with the *dairyman*, would go to law with him for his share of the *common* cow’s milk, or for her *trespassing*, or he would pledge his eighth or sixteenth part of *her* for his rent, or a bottle of whiskey, and the cow would be pounded and *re-pledged*, and *re-pounded*, and bailed, and *canted*; and things impossible for you to foresee,—perhaps impossible for your English imagination to conceive,

would happen to the cow and the dairyman. In all your attempts to serve my poor dear countrymen, you would find, that whilst you were demonstrating to them what would be their greatest advantage, they would be always making out a short cut, not a royal road, but a bog-road to their own *by-objects*. Paddy would be most grateful, most sincerely grateful to you, and would bless your honour, and your honour's honour, with all his heart; but he would, nevertheless, not scruple on every practicable occasion, to—to—to cheat, I will not say,—that is a coarse word,—but to circumvent you; at every turn you would find Paddy trying to walk round you, begging your honour's pardon—hat off, bowing to the ground to you—all the while laughing in your face if you found him out, and, if he outwitted you, loving you all the better for being such an innocent.

'Seriously, there is no doubt that the Irish people would, like all other people, learn honesty, punctuality, order, and economy, with proper motives and proper training, and in due time; but do not leave *time* out of your account. Very sorry should I be, either in jest or earnest, to discourage any of that enthusiasm of benevolence which animates you in their favour. But, as Paddy himself would say, 'Sure, it is better to be disappointed in the beginning than the end.' Each failure in attempts to do good in this country discourages the friends of humanity, and encourages the railers, scoffers, and croakers, and puts us back in hope, perhaps half a century; therefore, think before you begin, and begin upon a small scale, which you may extend as you please afterwards.'—vol. ii., pp. 432, 433.

But we must hasten towards the closing scenes of Mr. Allen's life and labours. The year 1842 saw him fast breaking up. In the month of September, 1839, he began to complain of 'a feeling of sinking and great weakness.' He notes, about the same time, that he had been overdone. 'My memory,' he says, 'is failing. I have noticed it for some time past.' 'I feel the infirmities of age coming on. Lord, prepare me to come to thee.' Twenty years before this (in 1819), meditating, on the banks of the Neva, upon the vanity of the world, his thoughts found utterance in these words: 'O, how little are all the pleasures and honours of the world, compared with the presence of the Redeemer and Comforter, when the Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God!' Now, the world itself was receding, and the teachings of truth were about to be tested by the realities of eternity. *Then*, he had to complain of numberless occupations, of 'strong, inward trials,' of 'imperfections staring' him 'in the face every day.' Now, he is privileged to speak of 'retirement and sweet calm,' with 'praise and thanksgiving.' *Then*, he had to pray, 'Oh to be delivered from pride and self-seeking!' 'Oh for that state of mind in which I should not feel hurt if all the world slighted

me !' Still,—for grace seeketh more grace,—he is constrained to supplicate for 'more humility,' and to 'wonder' that he, so unworthy, 'should feel peace in attempting publicly to advocate the Redeemer's blessed cause.'

William Allen had now passed his seventieth year, and his declining strength compelled him to resign many of the public engagements in which he had so long delighted. But he could not be idle; and he wished to avoid the peevishness and querulousness too often incident to the latter years even of Christian people. He bethought himself, therefore, of the very best method for making old age lovely. He determined to cultivate the acquaintance of all the young persons within his reach, and had fixed evenings for their amusement and instruction. He notices, with much satisfaction, the success of this pleasant device for securing sunshine in all weathers.

A year more rolls on, and the death of his beloved niece, Eliza Bradshaw, who resided with him, again brings eternity very near. 'I am now,' he says, 'much oftener than the returning day, looking towards the end of all things here, and fervent prayers arise for an increase of faith and love. O Lord, make me and keep me thine, in time and in eternity. Strong cries ascend by night and day to our Advocate with the Father, through whose atoning sacrifice alone, pardon and reconciliation can be experienced.' His beloved friend, Joseph John Gurney, hearing of his increasing weakness, writes to him in these terms: 'Thou hast been a kind and faithful father in the truth to me; and *heartily* do I love thee. So long as memory lasts, I shall never forget thy kindness; and sweet is the hope, that, deeply unworthy as I am of the least of the Lord's mercies, we shall spend an eternity together, in peace and joy unutterable. It is unspeakably precious to have this hope, and to know it to be as an anchor of our souls, sure and steadfast.' How speedily were these blessed hopes realized !

Though not now often heard in public ministry, there were still times when he was thus engaged; and 'more than a few,' say his biographers, 'who were present at his last vocal prayer, at Stoke Newington Meeting, will long remember the solemnity with which it was accompanied. Amongst the fervent petitions which he offered in great brokenness of spirit on this occasion, were the following:—

' Permit us, O heavenly Father ! we beseech Thee, to plead for the children of this people; that Thou wouldest be pleased afresh to extend to them the visitations of Thy love. Draw them, and attract them to

Thyself, make them Thy children : stain, we beseech Thee, in their view, all the attractions of this world. Preserve those that love Thee, through all, and grant, that by Thy power, they may be kept from falling, and finally be presented faultless, before the throne of Thy glory, with exceeding joy.'

The 15th of October, 1843, was the last time he attended meeting. In returning home he visited an invalid, with whom he conversed cheerfully ; and the day being very fine, he walked into his garden and field. He observed to his niece, Lucy Bradshaw, how particularly comfortable he felt, adding, 'I am afraid, my dear, we are almost *too happy*.' He spent much of the evening in reading, but the next day became very seriously indisposed, and, from his sudden prostration of strength, little hopes were entertained of his recovery. During his illness, affectionate consideration for those around him strikingly marked his character, and though extreme weakness, at times, clouded his mental perceptions, humility and love were uniformly the *clothing* of his spirit. He enjoyed having the Scriptures read to him, and also the accounts of those who have fought the good fight ; and in speaking of early Friends, he said, that he felt comforted in the hope of being one day united to all those worthies for ever. He afterwards added, with tears, 'Oh ! how often I think of those gracious words of the Saviour, 'That they may *be with me*, where I am !'

On the 30th of December, 1843, he fell asleep. As the moment of dissolution approached, a heavenly serenity settled on his countenance ; and his hands, which had been raised in the attitude of prayer, gradually sank upon his bosom, as the redeemed spirit gently passed away.

In a former article,\* incidentally alluding to Mr. Allen, we observed, that should his life ever be written, the great lesson to be gathered from it would be, the practicability of combining, through a long life, the obligations of trade, the pursuits of science, the enjoyments of philanthropy, and the duties of a gospel minister. And we remarked, that we could conceive of nothing better calculated to correct early and ill-directed ambition, to check youthful pride, or to cure unreasonable disgusts, than the observation of so healthful an example, as that of a man, whose varied honours were but successive developments of growing character, each appearing in its *appropriate* season, and each bringing with it its suitable reward. A careful perusal of the volumes before us has but confirmed the opinion we then

\* Vol. xvii. No. 3. New Series, March, 1845.

ventured to express. But the task has not been undertaken. While, therefore, we are fully sensible of our obligations to the fair editors, for the care and labour they have bestowed on the work; we are bound to say, that in our judgment, the Memoir would have been greatly increased in value, had the extracts from the journal been *largely* curtailed, and an attempt been made, by grouping the material, to give a more condensed and complete view of Mr. Allen's life and character. As it is, the reader is left to gather, as he best may, the leading features of the man, from voluminous and minute details of his everyday life; a work, which we fear very few will take the trouble to accomplish. In the foregoing pages we have endeavoured—how imperfectly we are well aware—to meet in some degree this want; and we shall now close the review, by briefly adverting to two or three of William Allen's leading characteristics.

And the first thing that strikes us is, his *systematic and unwearyed industry*. This was the secret of his success in life. It was not brilliant talent; it was not early advantages; it was not good fortune, that made him so useful and happy a man. It was *work*; patient and persevering toil, undertaken in the fear of God, and pursued steadily, under an abiding sense of duty. Mr. Allen wasted no time. He was moderate in diet and in sleep. He carefully gathered up, and appropriated, the crumbs of life which others fling under their tables. He always had work *at hand*; so that no one ever saw him loitering or lingering, in doubt as to what he should do next. He must have had naturally a quick apprehension; and he early acquired the power of steadily fixing his attention on any given subject. All his *habits*, both personal and mental, were good. His knowledge was accurate and well arranged. In later life—the habit of constant occupation surviving the power of attention—he attempted much, and accomplished little. But this was his infirmity.

A second, and scarcely less prominent feature in his character, was *extreme simplicity*. The child's heart clung to him through life. At fifty-six he mourns the loss of a little Norwegian horse, with the unsophisticated sorrow of boyhood. ‘Poor Pony,’ he says, ‘came up to me to-day to be caressed. I had hopes of his recovery, but in the evening my dear little grandson brought me word that he was dead. I felt low at the loss of this poor animal; it was a beautiful, affectionate, and useful creature; I never had occasion to strike it with a whip in my life. I hope not to repine, but really the things which I set my affections upon, are taken from me in a remarkable way.’ Sterne might have envied a sensibility so unaffected and sincere.

The third, and crowning distinction in his character, was *thorough disinterestedness*. The general unselfishness of his laborious life will not be disputed by any person capable of understanding and appreciating Christian goodness. But one remarkable instance of his inflexibility in what he deemed to be right, and his disregard of pecuniary interests when their promotion involved a questionable course, ought not to be unnoticed. We refer to his grateful but firm refusal to accede to the urgent request of the Emperor Alexander, that he would undertake the supply of drugs for the Russian army. The Royal Society, in recording Mr. Allen's decease, felt it right to state this circumstance in their obituary, and to add, 'To his honour be it spoken, he resisted a temptation *the value of which it would be difficult to estimate*.'

His *piety* breathes in every page of the Memoirs. Tholuck, who spent some time with him in 1835, refers with beautiful humility to a little incident which occurred just before he left Mr. Allen's house, and which is too characteristic to be omitted. There was a large company present when Tholuck took leave. Instead of accompanying him to the door, Mr. Allen withdrew with him and Thomas Shillitoe into another room. Here they sat down together in silence and had 'a sweet religious opportunity.' The two Friends addressed Tholuck in ministry, and they all felt it was a season ever to be remembered. Tholuck, referring to it in a letter to Mr. Allen, written after his arrival at home, says, 'My dearest fatherly friend, I thank you once more for all; I thank you more especially for the last holy quarter of an hour; we shall find it again with its fruits in eternity. Oh! my heart pants for more communion with aged brethren from whom I can learn, by whom I can be edified. Here I am surrounded by hundreds, who want continually to receive from *me*.' How beautiful it is to see the accomplished theologian thus sitting at the feet of an aged disciple of another communion, and what a testimony it bears to the piety of the man in whose house he had sojourned!

In the early part of his life, Mr. Allen was himself much influenced by this kind of private and personal ministry, peculiar, we believe, to the Society of Friends. Such communications were evidently regarded by him as, in a certain sense, authoritative. He speaks in one place, of Samuel Emlen being '*commissioned* by the Great Master' to say a word to him. In another, of Mary Stacey, after sitting for some time in silence, '*ministering*' to him 'as if she had been acquainted with the workings' of his 'mind:' and he evidently receives her '*assurance*' that God was dealing with him in love, as a message from heaven. On another of these occasions the ministering

friend *predicts* his designation for service in the church; and again and again, are silent worshippers spoken of as receiving *sensible* manifestations of Divine favour, being ‘baptized together,’ ‘overshadowed with a precious covering,’ ‘encircled in the arms of Divine love.’

Yet Mr. Allen was no visionary; nor was he in the slightest degree tinged with fanaticism. Speaking of a fire which took place at Plough Court, and in which the escape of the family, and the preservation of the premises was, considering the nature of the accident, little short of a miracle; he only ventures to remark, ‘it was got under, I trust I may say providentially, though I felt myself unworthy of such a favour.’

His views of Divine truth (we pass no judgment on his peculiarities as a Friend) were sober and scriptural. That they were evangelical is evident from the terms he uses in his Diary, in relation to the merits, atonement, and justifying righteousness of Christ. Hence he rejoices in the declaratory minute made by the yearly meeting of the Society of Friends, in 1829, stating that they can have no fellowship with any persons or bodies of persons, who deny the fundamental principles of the Christian religion, and mentioning what those points are, ‘in some of the strongest passages of Scripture relative to the divinity and offices of the Redeemer.’

His habitual spirit and temper, allowing of course for human infirmity, was humble and devout. He shrank from strife, as an uncongenial element, and considered that he had no call to mingle in the struggles of party. When attacked by the press, as he frequently was, he could defend himself with point and vigour; but he considered, as a general rule, that the best way to overcome a bad spirit in an opponent was to ‘starve it out.’ Although much interested in public affairs, he was soon ‘oppressed by politics,’ and became ‘increasingly convinced’ that ‘the less Friends mingle in the politics of the world the better.’

In attention to the spiritual welfare of his household, Mr. Allen, even in his busiest seasons, was most exemplary. He frequently speaks of the contrition, peace, or joy experienced by himself, or manifested by others, at these seasons. Far be it from us to doubt the reality of this blessedness. We greatly prefer vocal prayer, yet we cannot doubt that many of these silent meetings of the family, broken only by the reverential reading of the Holy Scriptures, were in deed and in truth, ‘times of refreshing from the Lord.’ To all his dependents Mr. Allen was kind and attentive. Those who served him faithfully he loved with paternal tenderness, and watched with parental care. Nor did his interest in them cease when they

left his house. He speaks of the discovery of an old servant of his mother's, who had been reduced to poverty by the misconduct of a brother, as almost providential. 'I was quite affected,' he says, 'and blamed her for not letting me know; for I was not aware that she was living.'

But we must conclude. There is one other point on which we should have liked to have said a few words, had not this article already extended to such an unreasonable length. We refer to the fact that Mr. Allen, acting on his principles as a Friend, undertook his journeys and other labours under the distinct impression of *a Divine call*. Whether he was always right, as to the character of these secret suggestions, may with some be matter of doubt. We are satisfied that he believed them to be from above; and we are sure that, whether agreeable to his inclinations, or involving painful sacrifice, they would have been equally regarded. At what point the strong conviction that a truth or a duty is given us from above, is most likely to mingle with the whisperings of self-will or the desire of self-pleasing, it is always hard to determine. 'When the conscience is clear, when the man is lowly, when he has been subdued by discipline, the opposition (between the teachings of heaven and self-exaltation) seems clear to him as between day and night; the delusion of his own heart is manifested to him, by the light which God has kindled there. But amidst the noise of human applause, the distinction, once so definite, vanishes; the precious and the vile become hopelessly mingled.'\* This, however, we will say: Woe to the man who imagines he has no call—no vocation given him of God! Woe to the man—a still deeper woe—who, *having a call*, thinks himself at liberty to deny or evade its claims, to falsify it, or to fritter it away! Let earnest and thoughtful young men think of these things, and ponder well their goings. If they doubt as to the promptings of duty, let them remember, in this, as in every other perplexity, that 'light is sown for the upright'—that 'before honour is humility'—that the path of lowness is the path of safety, and the highway of wisdom, that which was trodden by Him of whom it is written,—*He pleased not himself*.

\* Maurice, on the Religions of the World.

ART. VI.—*Histoire des Girondins* (History of the Girondists). By A. de Lamartine. 8 vols. Paris. 1847. Furne and Co.

THE National Convention, like its predecessors—the Constituent and the Legislative Assemblies—had its especial mission to fulfil; and, like its predecessors, in the performance of its task, was compelled to yield to popular impulse, and constantly did more than it, at first, intended to do; though hardly ever so much as the people required. The task of the Constituent Assembly was to save the nation from bankruptcy, and a tottering throne from the abyss on the verge of which the nobility, the clergy, and a profligate court insisted on keeping it. This task had been imposed upon it, both by the king's summons, and by the mandates of the electors. In the accomplishment of it, the Assembly not only experienced a most unjustifiable opposition, on the part of the two privileged orders, of the court and of the king himself; but also was threatened by them with violent dissolution, and even with subsequent penalties, for its strict adherence to the object of its convocation. The people rose in support of their representatives; and nothing less than the abolition of all the privileges of the two orders, and the restriction of the kingly authority within constitutional limits, and under national control, could satisfy them. The Constituent Assembly complied with the popular will; but within the limits of reason, of justice, and of the true interests of the country. The nobility, the clergy, and the court were deprived of their haughty, sordid, and injurious pre-eminence, and subjected, like all other Frenchmen, to the fiscal and civil laws, the whole weight of which they had hitherto thrown on the *Tiers Etat*—on the agricultural, commercial, and working classes. As to the king, notwithstanding his avowed duplicity, and his blind subjection to the hostile views and passions of his queen, the Constituent Assembly, with a forbearance—an indulgence which M. de Lamartine himself blames, left him on his throne, with prerogatives more extensive than those of the kings of England.

The mission of the Legislative Assembly was to watch over the due observance of the newly established constitution, both by the executive and by all the citizens: the adoption in concert with the king, of the measures best calculated to secure a regular and peaceful management of the domestic affairs of the country—the enactment and enforcement of such laws as were necessary against royalist or republican transgressors—the reconciliation of an old dynasty with the new institutions, and the consolidation of the constitutional monarchy in France. The legislators faith-

fully discharged their duties ; but the representative of the old dynasty would not be reconciled with the new institutions. Far from it ; he openly exercised his constitutional prerogatives, to oppose and paralyse the working of the constitution, by vetoing the decrees of the Assembly, by dismissing honest and liberal ministers, and by selecting his advisers from among the enemies of the constitution ; while, at the same time, he was secretly encouraging, in the interior, the insurrectionary attempts of the nobility and of the clergy, and urging, too successfully, the absolute monarchs and the emigrants to hasten the invasion of France, and the restoration of the monarchy to its former state. The people rose again, under the conviction that royalty was, like aristocracies and state churches, irreconcilable with the liberty and safety of a nation ; and to compel the Legislative Assembly to depose the king, as they had compelled the Constituent Assembly to annihilate the privileged orders.

To save the country, to subdue the domestic and foreign foe, and to inflict condign punishment on all who had promoted civil war and foreign invasion ; such was the mission of the National Convention : a mission given by an indignant population, to the deputies, in every department of France, after sanctioning the Revolution of the 10th of August and all its consequences. The importance of the task cannot be conceived, unless the reader is reminded that, at the moment when the elections took place, thirty-six thousand Austrians were threatening the Belgian frontier of France ; eighty thousand Prussians with twenty thousand emigrants had invaded Champaign, had taken Longwy and Verdun, and were marching on Paris ; the Germanic empire was throwing on the banks of the Rhine one hundred and thirty thousand combatants ; thirty-eight thousand Piedmontese and sixty thousand Spaniards were ready for the attack, on the south-western and the southern frontiers ; England was hastening her warlike preparations, to join the coalition ; and, in the meanwhile, royalist insurrections were raging in the south and west of France. The whole of the French army hardly amounted to one-third of the forces they were to encounter. To the most formidable attack, that of the Prussians who, with the emigrants, amounted to one hundred thousand men, Dumouriez could only oppose seventeen thousand soldiers. A frantic despair animated all the citizens. The electors were tendering their votes, as the last will of men going to die, and were leaving the polling offices to rush on the frontiers ; and most of them, when quitting their homes, thus addressed the civic authorities : ‘ We are going to fight and die in defence of our country ; but when marching against the foreign invaders, shall we abandon our mothers, our wives, our sisters, our children to the mercy of our domestic

enemies? Let the accomplices of the tyrant be exterminated. Their death alone can secure the safety of our unprotected families.'

Before the Assembly, elected under such circumstances, had entered their hall, the work of extermination had already begun. Here, again, we must briefly relate, in their proper order, the events which took place from the 10th of August to the 21st of September, when the National Convention met for the first time. Without this preliminary *résumé*, the whole of the discords and measures of the Conventionels are incomprehensible.

We have shown, in our preceding article, that the Legislative Assembly had constantly resisted the general irritation, and that even the triumph of the insurrection could not wrest from them a single measure in opposition to the constitution which they had sworn to uphold. Nothing could equal in irreflection and injustice the judgment pronounced by M. Lamartine,\* on the character of this Assembly :—‘ Le peuple,’ says he, ‘ au 10 Août, fût plus homme d'état que ses législateurs l'assemblée ne prenait par le gouvernail. Le peuple s'y précipita avec ce génie de la circonstance et cette témérité, de résolution qui risque tout, pour tout sauver quand tout est inévitablement perdu. Le mécanisme de la constitution ne fonctionnait plus. Un éclair de conviction il le démontra qu'on ne pouvait plus le réparer. Il lui le brisa ; ce fût le 10 Août.’ The people, *the better statesmen* (according to M. de Lamartine) set to work. They dissolved the municipal council, and appointed a new one. They re-organised in the same manner the committees of the sections of Paris. The manifesto of the Duke of Brunswick, proclaiming that all the honest men of the capital were ready to welcome his arrival, led them to establish a committee of *surveillance générale*, to watch over the plots of those *honest men*. The protest of Lafayette and some of his generals against the suspension of the king, and, subsequently, the news of his flight, and of the bombardment and the surrender of Longwy, arriving at the same time in Paris; caused the Municipal Council to demand from the Legislative Assembly the organization of a court martial to try the accomplices of the court, of Lafayette, of the emigrants and of the invaders. The demand being rejected, a deputation of the Council was sent to the Assembly, on the following day, to insist on the organization of the tribunal ; and the legislature yielded, but not without restricting the jurisdiction of the court to the crimes of the 10th of August.

The committee of *surveillance générale* had no sooner been established, than it assumed the right of arresting all persons

\* Vol. iii. pp. 269—274.

suspected of royalism. The ministry appointed by the Legislative Assembly,\* after the suspension of the king, could not see without alarm this usurpation of powers, which placed the liberty, and, probably, the life of all the citizens at the mercy of an irresponsible committee of the insurrectionary Communal Council. With a view to vindicate the supremacy of the executive, and to prevent or mitigate excesses which it was easy to anticipate, the ministers resolved to propose to the Assembly a decree, authorising them to order domiciliary visits, and take such other measures as were necessary to secure the persons implicated in the plots of the court. Danton, supported by all his colleagues, was the spokesman on this occasion, and said but a few words. The dangers of the country justified his application for extraordinary powers, which the Assembly granted, and the decree was unanimously adopted. It was carried into execution on the following day, and about five thousand persons (says M. de Lamartine) were arrested; more than the half of whom were almost immediately released. The others were sent to the several prisons of Paris, to be successively tried.

A few days had hardly elapsed, when, on the evening of the first of September, the news reached Paris of the bombardment and surrender of Verdun. The particulars of this event were made public on the following day. The civil authorities and the inhabitants, after three hours' siege, assembled, and insisted on capitulating. The military governor, Colonel Beaurepaire, vainly opposed a disgraceful surrender. He was outvoted; but when the pen was presented to him to sign the capitulation: 'No,' said he; 'I have sworn to surrender only as a corpse to the enemies of my country. Survive your infamy, if you can. As to me, these are my last words: I die a free man. I bequeath my blood to the coward, as an ignominy,—to the brave, as an example!' and placing the mouth of a pistol to his heart, he fired, and fell dead in the council-room. This patriotic suicide did not deter the others from their purpose. Not only did they sign the capitulation, but they also, with the principal inhabitants of the town, sent their daughters, in their best dresses, to welcome the king of Prussia, and strew flowers on his path.

The rage of the population of Paris, on reading or hearing these particulars, rose to its pitch. 'Death to the nobles, to the royalists, to the priests, to all the accomplices of the court, and of the emigrants who are preparing to do here what

\* Roland (interior), Servan (war), Clavière (finances), Danton (justice), Monge (marine), Lebrun (foreign affairs), Grouvelle (secretary of the council). The daughter of the last-mentioned gentleman has been kept in prison, by Louis Philippe, for the last eight years, as guilty of conspiring against him.

they have done at Verdun! In six days the king of Prussia may be here: let him meet, instead of girls and flowers, the corpses of the traitors!' Such were the exclamations of an infuriated multitude, filling the streets and all the public places; and, that very evening, the massacres in the prisons began. Horror-struck at these atrocious executions, the Assembly, the Ministry, the Commune, and the mayor of Paris, Pethion, endeavoured to prevent their continuance. The commissaries of the Assembly and of the Commune, however, found their entreaties, and those of Roland and Pethion, rudely unheeded. They had no military force at their disposal, to disperse or to seize the assassins. The national guard, disorganized after the 10th of August, did not answer to the call of the authorities, who vainly bewailed what they could not prevent. In many provincial towns, the example set in Paris was but too faithfully followed; and the continued advance of the Prussians threatened to extend those butcheries to all parts of France.

M. de Lamartine, when relating in all their heart-rending details these lamentable events, says, '*La pensée en appartient à Marat, l'acceptation et la responsabilité à Danton, l'exécution au comité de surveillance, la complicité à plusieurs, la lache tolérance à tous.*' By representing all the facts in their proper order, their connexion becomes evident, and we arrive at a contrary conclusion. The sudden and irresistible impulse of popular revenge was the sole prompter of the massacres. Their very beginning, as related by all historians, and by M. de Lamartine himself, proves that they were not the result of a preconcerted plot. Towards the evening of the 2nd of September, five coaches containing prisoners, and removing them from the *Hôtel de Ville* to the prison of *L'Abbaye*, passed through the *Carrefour Bussy*, followed by an immense mob loading them with execrations. At that place, in a booth erected in the open air, some municipal officers were receiving the enlistment of numerous volunteers. At the sight of the carriages, the crowd which filled the space re-echoed the imprecations. 'Here are the accomplices of the Prussians! these are the men to murder you all, if you let them live!' These words, uttered by hundreds of voices, soon produced their effect. The prisoners were attacked in the carriages, while the coachmen hastened towards their destination, distant about two hundred yards from the *Carrefour Bussy*. The crowd followed, and arrived at the *Abbaye*, where the massacre immediately began.

It is not unlikely that, by his perpetual denunciations and his provocations to vengeance, in his newspaper, *l'Ami du Peuple*, Marat had contributed to familiarize the minds of his readers with the idea of such summary justice; and, so far,

*the thought of it may be said to belong to him.* We are inclined to think, though we do not know it, that, when apprised of the beginning of the butcheries, he approved of them, and encouraged their continuance, and that the Committee of *Surveillance Générale* acted in conformity with his views; but the responsibility of those atrocities cannot, with justice, be cast on Danton. It is true that most of the prisoners who perished had been arrested in execution of the decree of the Assembly, enacted on the proposal of Danton: but Danton spoke in the name, in the presence, and with the assent, of his colleagues in the ministry. Besides, it is certain that the object of the ministry, and of the assembly, was to put an end to the encroachments of the Commune on the authority of the legislators and of the executive; and to deprive the revolutionary sections of all pretence for agitation and new insurrections, by taking the initiative in measures which, however severe, were preferable to the *justice du peuple*, with which all suspected persons, the legislators and the ministers themselves, were threatened.

Danton, during the massacres, acted in concert with his colleagues to stop the effusion of blood; but, when the horrid tragedy ceased, he differed from them, not as to its character, but as to the measures to be adopted in consequence of it. Roland, Clavière, Servan, and all the Girondists, insisted on a prompt and strict investigation of those abominable transactions, and on the punishment of their authors and their accomplices. Danton told them that it was beyond their power to punish crimes which they had been unable to prevent or to restrain: that, without any armed force at their disposal, it was madness to attempt the thing, when eighty thousand armed inhabitants of Paris had, by their inaction, and notwithstanding the urgent appeal of the legislative and municipal authorities, if not sanctioned, at least amnestied, the murders. Seeing that his observations could not shake the determination of his colleagues and their friends, he pronounced those prophetic words, 'You will not succeed: you will only prepare your own ruin, and perhaps the ruin of the country. Let what is done be done, and let us hasten to bury the victims, and with them, if possible, all remembrance of their death.\*'

Madame Roland, who was present at the discussion, concluded from the opposition of Danton that he feared an investigation and that, therefore, he must have been in the horrid plot. She even went farther in her inference. A man like Danton could nowhere play a secondary part; he must have been—he was—the originator, the occult director of the massacres. She unfortu-

\* These details were given to us, in 1826, by Garat, who had taken a part in the discussion, and supported the views of Danton.

nately prevailed upon her husband, upon Guadet, and most of the Girondists, to adopt her conclusions as realities. The complicity of Danton became the creed of a party, whilst the perpetrators of those execrable butcheries, mistaking his forbearance for approbation, rallied round him, and affected submission to his leadership.

Such are the circumstances under which the National Convention met for the first time, on the 20th of September, 1792.\* All the members had been chosen by the electors among the men who, since the opening of the *États Généraux*, in 1789, had distinguished themselves by their attachment to the popular cause, in the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies, in the municipal and judiciary offices, and in the press. All the Girondists had been returned, and their ranks were re-inforced by the adjunction of most of the late members of the National Assembly, among whom we may name Lanjuinais, Rabaud, St. Etienne, and Fauchet.

The other members of the Constituent Assembly, sent to the Convention, formed a sort of neutral party, with the exception of Robespierre, Barrère, Herault de Sechelle, Lepeltier de St. Fargeau, and some few men who placed themselves at the head of the representatives of Paris, and of a large number of men who were elected for the first time; all of whom had been chosen on account of their ultra-democratic principles. The *Gironde*, the *Plaine*, the *Montagne*, were the designations generally given to, and accepted by, the three sections of the Convention. At the top of the *Montagne*, on a solitary bench, sat a man; his head wrapped in a dirty handkerchief, his neck and hairy chest uncovered, his dress of the coarsest stuff and in the filthiest condition; an object of disgust or of horror to all; and yet calm, impassible, or, sometimes, opposing a contemptuous smile to the marked aversion of his colleagues, as if conscious of his own unfathomable superiority.—It was MARAT.

On the very day, at the very hour, of the first meeting of the Assembly, the armies under Dumouriez were triumphing over the Prussians, at Valmy; whilst the news received that morning in Paris, representing his skilful movements as a continuation of the preceding disasters and a retreat, had spread consternation in the capital, and added new fuel to the popular fury. The first debates in the convention could not but be influenced by these adverse circumstances, and exhibit in all their animosity the conflicting passions of the two extremes of the Assembly. The abrogation of royalty, and the proclamation of the republic, were unanimously voted; but the unanimity of

\* M. de Lamartine says (page 28, vol. 4) the 20th, and afterwards (page 77), the 21st.

the Convention ceased after this first deliberation. Since the massacres in the prisons, Roland, the minister of the interior, in all his circulars to the departmental authorities, and in the newspapers over which he had any influence, constantly demanded a severe inquiry into these abominable crimes, and the prosecution of their perpetrators ; and the Girondists had done the same, during the last days of the Legislative Assembly. They all renewed their attacks immediately after the meeting of the Convention, in the presence of Marat, the instigator of those butcheries, and of many actors and approvers who had been elected by the constituency of Paris. Danton, who had also been elected, and who had resigned the ministry of justice,\* to fulfil his duties of legislator, was included, though not named, in the accusations. It could not be expected that these men would patiently submit to the attacks of which they were the object. They all, with the exception of Danton, not only admitted their participation in the scenes of the first days of September, but also dared to declare enemies of the country, and auxiliaries of the emigrants and of the Prussians, all those who were so constantly condemning a great deed of popular justice, and threatening the best friends of liberty and of the national independence. Marat, in his *Ami du Peuple*, the Committee of *Surveillance Générale*, in their deliberations, the committees of the revolutionary sections, and the clubs of the Jacobins and the Cordeliers, denounced Roland, his wife, and the Girondists, and excited the people to murder them all, as the only means of saving the country.

The news of the victory of Valmy, and of the retrograde movement of the Prussian army, happily came in time to prevent another popular insurrection, and to justify the Girondists against the accusation of having, in concert with the court, provoked the declaration of war, to betray the country, and to restore the king to absolute authority. So long as the French generals and their armies had experienced reverses, the people were easily induced to believe those absurd charges ; but now that the man who, as the head of the Girondist ministry, and minister for foreign affairs, had proposed the declaration of war, had, as general-in-chief, obtained a glorious success, and saved the country, all the accusations fell to the ground. The Girondists seized the opportunity to denounce the arbitrary arrests ordered by the Committee of *Surveillance Générale*, and to demand its suppression, and the repression of the encroachments of the municipality of Paris on the prerogatives of the government. The speech of Vergniaud, who made the motion, remained un-

\* Garat was appointed to the office, on the resignation of Danton.

answered, and the Assembly decreed that the subject should be taken into serious consideration.

For a few days, the news received from the army of Dumouriez continuing to be very favourable, and giving the certainty of the entire evacuation of the territory, allayed the anxieties of the population of Paris, deprived the agitators of their main engine of insurrection, and promised to the true patriots the speedy restoration of order and security. Unfortunately, the invasion of the Belgian frontier of France soon rekindled the public indignation. The Duke of Saxe Teschen, governor of the Netherlands, at the head of twenty-five thousand men, marched upon Lille. On the 29th of September, he summoned the commandant of the town to surrender, and on his refusal, immediately began bombarding the fortress. The bombardment lasted seven days and seven nights without any interruption. During that time, thirty thousand red hot cannon-balls, and ten thousand shells of the weight of one hundred pounds each, were poured on the city. The Arch-duchess Maria Christina of Austria herself fired the heaviest mortar-pieces of a battery erected in her presence, and under her direction, against the most densely populated part of the city. Thus the sister of Marie Antoinette was adding to the already too intense hatred of which the captive queen was the object; and the clubs, the Sections, the most energetic part of the population, indignant at such barbarous warfare, openly threatened to repair to the Temple, and to put to death all the royal prisoners.

Fortunately, the accounts of the ultimate success of Dumouriez, of the disastrous retreat of the Prussians, of the rapid march of Beurnonville, with fifteen thousand men, whom the general-in-chief had dispatched to the relief of the bombarded city, and the arrival of Dumouriez himself in Paris, gradually appeased the popular fury, the violence of which was constantly regulated by the dangers of the country. The hasty raising of the siege of Lille, at the approach of Beurnonville, at last restored the security against foreign enemies, without which internal concord and tranquility could not be re-established.

During the few days which Dumouriez passed in Paris, to concert with the ministers the means of carrying into execution his plans to expel the Austrians from the Netherlands, he endeavoured to impress upon the minds of all, the necessity of union among sincere patriots of all parties, and made use, for that purpose, of the influence which his victory and his popularity had obtained for him. He first spoke to Danton, whose intelligence, energy of mind, and warmth of heart, were well known to the general, and requested him to make peace

with the Girondists, and with Roland; and, thus, strengthen their party,—the only one which could give to France a free, a just, and a humane government. Danton readily assented, and said that, he was as desirous, as the general, of acting with the Girondists; ‘but,’ added he, ‘you will not find them in the same disposition. *Parce que je crois dangereux de remuer le sang de Septembre, ils veulent m'en couvrir.* As to Roland, I am not his enemy. I saved him twice during the last three weeks, and he acknowledged it, until his wife put into his head that I had myself provoked the warrant of the committee of *surveillance*, and the attacks of Marat against him. At all events, do as you like, and I will ratify all.’

Vergniaud and Gensonné were the friends of Dumouriez. He represented to them the utter impossibility of their party resisting, for any length of time, the daily increasing violence of the Commune, of the Sections, of the Jacobins, and of the Cordeliers, who seemed all to act under the inspirations of Marat; unless they secured for the defence of their principles and their sound views, the support of men who had over the population of Paris a still greater influence than Marat. He entreated them, for the sake of the country, and for their own safety, to make friends with Danton, who was then at the height of his popularity; and even to conciliate Robespierre, whose integrity, and fidelity to the cause of the revolution, commanded the respect of all, and whose support would silence the Jacobins and the Commune. The two Girondist leaders promised to consider the matter, and to consult with their friends.

Dumouriez spoke afterwards to Roland, who at once admitted that the proposed reconciliation would enable the Assembly to establish its supreme authority over the Commune, and give to the executive the strength and freedom of action, without which it was impossible to carry on the government. But then added he, ‘This government must be the dictatorship of Danton.’ ‘Rather the dictatorship of Danton than that of Marat with his rabble,’ replied Dumouriez: ‘and mark my word, you have no other alternative.’ Garat, who was present, supported the views of Dumouriez, who, after a long discussion, told them, ‘I have but little time to spare. In a few days I leave to join my army. Do what I recommend you, and fear not. Before three months are elapsed I shall have freed the Netherlands from the Austrian yoke: let me not, on my return, again witness your fatal divisions.’

Nearly thirty years after this conversation,\* Garat was re-

\* Garat came over to England in 1821, and, during his stay, passed the greatest part of his time at Little Ealing, the residence of General Dumouriez, before his removal to Turville Park.

minding General Dumouriez of his patriotic intentions, and lamenting with him the causes and the consequences of the failure of their joint efforts. '*Cette malheureuse femme a tout perdu et s'est perdue elle-même*,' said Garat, speaking of Madame Roland; '*au moment où, sans elle, tout pouvait être sauvé*'.

Like all the historians of the French revolution, M. de Lamartine devotes too many pages to this lady, and judges her with too great indulgence. '*Res est sacra miser*,' no doubt; and we should not stop to express an opinion at variance with that of all the contemporary writers, were it not that the elucidation of the most important events in modern history requires of every one giving his evidence, the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

Roland and his wife were, if we may say so, a *bourgeois* duplicate of Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette. Roland had but an average share of intelligence; his knowledge was limited to the administrative routine, and the imperfect political economy prevailing or attempting to prevail in 1780. His mind was deficient in activity, and its operations were slow and laborious. Cool, phlegmatic, no passion had ever disturbed the peace of his soul. His ambition had never dreamed of the possession of the important office to which he attained, with a well deserved character for integrity and patriotism. Madame Roland was much younger than her husband, her intelligence was much superior, her general information much more extensive; and the activity of her mind, the warmth of her feelings, the fire of her imagination, the readiness and strength of her language completely contrasted with the mediocrity of her husband in all these respects. Her beauty was as remarkable as her talents, and the energy of her character, perhaps, beyond what befitted her sex. Like Louis XVI, Roland was conscious of the superiority of his wife, and readily yielded to her advice. She had long contracted the habit of ruling in private life, when Roland was appointed minister of the interior, and she could not get rid of it in her new situation. The extension of her rule was, in her opinion, the necessary consequence of her elevation. She expected from all, the same deference and the same compliance which she obtained from her husband. Too many legislators, and more particularly the young Girondists, admirers of the beauty of the woman, encouraged her pretensions by submitting to them. She was their idol and their oracle; and soon arrived at the point of being astonished at the resistance of any one to her decisions, of regarding as enemies of the country all who questioned the soundness, the timeliness, or the efficacy of her measures; or the propriety of her openly avowed direction of her husband, in the management of the affairs of his depart-

ment ; of her being present and taking part in the discussions at the cabinet councils. Robespierre had ceased to visit Roland, on account of her assuming manners, after telling her that, ‘listening more and speaking less, would do her and her husband much good ;’ hence her hatred for Robespierre. Danton, who was less particular in the expression of his thoughts, wounded both the pride and the feelings of the woman ; while, at the same time he threw an insinuation on the virtue of the wife. From that moment Danton was considered by her, and by most of the Girondists, as a monster. To a jest, rather coarse, they replied by virulent attacks and atrocious imputations, and they finished by so firmly persuading themselves of the truth of their charges, that they could not bear the idea of a reconciliation with such a man. Madame Roland said to Garat, ‘*Plutôt mourir que de rien devoir à une alliance avec Danton.*

Dumouriez, however, made another attempt before leaving Paris ; he invited to a dinner the principal of the Girondists, to meet Danton and Roland. After the dessert, the general addressed them all, entreating them, for the sake of their country, to forgive and forget their past discords, and to unite against the ruffians who had deluged and would again deluge Paris with blood. He expressed himself with such effect that Siéyes, Condorcet, Gensonné, Brissot, Pethion, and Vergniaud agreed to a reconciliation. The most devoted to Madame Roland, Buzot, Barbaroux, Ducos, gave a silent assent. Guadet alone refused. Danton vainly entreated him to offer to the country the sacrifice of his resentment. Guadet remained inflexible. In the hope of a more complete success, Dumouriez induced Roland to invite them all to his residence with Danton. At this second re-union, the general prevailed on Madame Roland to treat Danton with proper regard and kindness, and to set to her friends the example of reconciliation.

Robespierre had not been present at these re-unions. His simple and abstemious way of living had, from the beginning of his public career, kept him away from all convivial parties, and besides that, he thought them a waste of time. His refusal to meet the Girondists at Roland’s was considered as a symptom of his implacable hostility. All that Danton could say to the contrary was of no avail, and his warnings against the danger of attacking a man who had, and deserved, the highest character for integrity, morality and patriotism, were ridiculed by Madame Roland and her friends. She could forgive a coarse expression, on the part of a man of impulse like Danton, but could not forget the disdainful advice of the grave and rigid deputy of Arras.

On the 29th of October, 1792, Roland, in a report on the

situation of Paris, presented to the Assembly, denounced the encroachments of the Commune on the executive and legislative authorities; the co-operation of some members of the Convention in the measures of the Committee of *Surveillance*; the atrocities already perpetrated, and the daily provocations to new atrocities. The minister concluded with a request that the Assembly should immediately pass the necessary laws to subject the Commune to the legislative authority; to inflict on the provocators and perpetrators of the crimes committed a condign punishment; and to devise the most stringent means for suppressing the existing agitation, and for subduing the agitators. No names were inserted in the report; yet the public clearly saw that it was a blow aimed at Robespierre, Danton, and Marat, who had the greatest influence over the Jacobins, the Commune, and the mob. Louvet, Brissot, Barbaroux, and their friends, encouraged by the apparent approbation given to the report, on the part of the Assembly, undertook, a few days afterwards, to complete the ministerial report, the work of Madame Roland, and brought at the tribune a formal accusation against Marat and Robespierre. Danton interposed for the last time, to prevent the Girondists from committing such a blunder, as to place these two men on the same line; and, thus bring upon themselves the joint hostility of two parties which had not hitherto acted together, and even of his own friends. They persisted in their rash attempt. Marat, whom Danton had, in some sort, pointed at, as deserving alone the accusation, contented himself with smiling at the eloquent tirades of Louvet. Robespierre easily confuted the indefinite charges brought against him; one of which was: ‘*d'avoir souffert qu'on le désignât comme le seul homme vertueux en France qui peut sauver le peuple.*’ The Convention rejected the motion.

From that moment, the Girondists who regularly met at Madame Roland’s,\* and who, on that account, were considered as acting under her inspiration, and called *Rolandists*, were exposed to the incessant incriminations of all the parties whom they had so imprudently attacked in the persons of their leaders; and unfortunately these incriminations, though unfounded, had some semblance of truth—enough to mislead and irritate the people. We have seen how the Girondists and the Legislative Assembly resisted to the last, the demands which came from all

\* Vergniaud, Grangeneuve, Gensonné, Condorcet, Ducos, Fonfrede, had their meeting at Madame Récamier’s, who was superior in every respect to Madame Roland, without the pretensions of the latter. M. de Lamartine does not give the name of this lady, who is still living; and, till lately, continued to charm by her wit and her amiable qualities, all who had the good fortune of being admitted to her retreat, l’Abbaye au Bois, rue de Sèvres.

parts of France, for the deposition of the king ; and even would not decree it, when the Commune, the Sections, the Clubs,—all the population of Paris—had *de facto* abolished royalty, and held the King and the Assembly itself in their power. It was easy to infer from the resistance of the Girondists, their predilection for monarchial institutions ; and to ascribe to this predilection, their hatred to the Commune, the Sections, the Jacobins, and the leaders of the people, who had prepared and achieved the triumph of the 10th of August. Thus, an accusation of promoting anarchy subjected its authors to the charge of having, to the last, maintained on his throne a treacherous king, and of wishing for his restoration. The consequence was the universal cry : Death to the King, and to all who dare to undertake his defence !

In a work published in 1826,\* it is said : ‘Ce ne sont pas, comme on l'a écrit, les discussions sur le sort de Louis XVI qui ont amené les funestes dissensions conventionnelles ; ce sont, au contraire, ces dissensions qui ont fait de ces discussions une question de vie et de mort.’ M. de Lamartine now confirms this opinion, expressed twenty two years ago. He states, that neither Danton, nor Robespierre, nor even Marat himself, wished for the death of Louis XVI. ‘Marat, who was the first to demand the trial of the royal prisoner, proposed it as a challenge to the Girondists.’† The challenge once given, and, given in the terms above mentioned, could not be declined without danger, and, when accepted, could result only in the death of the doomed monarch. The first question, that of culpability, could not but be decided affirmatively ; and the Assembly unanimously found Louis XVI. guilty. The constitutional inviolability could not be invoked by the prince for his personal acts in violation of the constitution ; acts committed with the object of betraying the country, and of promoting a foreign invasion. For the same crimes, the laws of all nations, at all times, and to this present moment, pronounce the penalty of death. Finally, the Convention had been invested by its constituents with national omnipotence, and its decisions were not subject to an appeal to the nation. All these points, however, were questioned and lengthily debated by the Girondists, but without success ; and the result of the trial, to which they had readily given their consent, in order to repel the charge of partiality to Louis XVI., was the proof, given by themselves, of their resolution to save the unfortunate prince, and of their inability to accomplish it.

\* “Le General Dumouriez et la Révolution Francaise.”

† Vol. iv. pp. 249—251.

Dumouriez, who, on the opening of the campaign against the Austrians, had gained the battle of Jemmapes, and in six weeks had conquered the whole of Belgium, hastened to Paris at the beginning of the trial, with the intention of exerting all his influence to save the life of the King. He first applied to Danton, whom he found disposed to adopt his views, but who would not act before securing the co-operation of Robespierre, without which the attempt was sure to fail. Barrère, at the request of Dumouriez, undertook to gain over the deputy of Arras, who hesitated, and even pitied the misfortunes of the royal prisoner; but his hatred against Louvet, Vergniaud, and the Girondists, subdued his better feelings. He refused to do an act of mercy which would serve the views of his enemies, and would be regarded by them as a triumph. Garat, minister of justice, was equally unsuccessful with many other Montagnards; and after some equally fruitless attempts, Dumouriez saw, with despair, that his victories were of no avail to him; and a few days after the execution of the king, he resolved to resign his command. The Girondists dissuaded him from his resolve by representing to him, that his resignation would either be the signal of the disorganisation of his army, or place it under the command of some favourite of the Montagnards; and that in either case it would be the death-blow of their party and the ruin of the country. Dumouriez yielded to their entreaties.

Most of the Girondists had reluctantly voted the death of Louis XVI., with the hope that the sacrifice of their feelings would be accepted as a confutation of the calumnies of their accusers, and as a pledge of their unflinching patriotism; and that it would enable them to rally to their cause all those members of the Convention, who, although ardent republicans, rejected the anti-social and atrocious doctrines which were proclaimed by Marat, and adopted by the Sections and the Clubs of Paris. Their hopes were not entirely disappointed. The majority of the Convention soon evinced a disposition to stand by them, against both the Montagne and the Commune. They did not wait long for an opportunity of trying their strength. Marat, in his newspaper, *L'Ami du Peuple*, of the 23rd of February, openly called upon the people to plunder all the residences and warehouses of the capitalists and rich merchants, and to hang the owners at their own doors. The article concluded with an apology for the massacres of September, a menace against the Girondists, and a challenge to them which must be given here: ‘Infamous hypocrites! ye who are endeavouring to undo the country, under the pretence of restoring the reign of the law, ascend the tribune! dare to denounce me! with this very newspaper in my hand, I am ready to confound you.’ The challenge

was immediately accepted; but it was Barrère who first denounced the villainous provocation, and invoked against its author all the severity of the laws. The decree of accusation was passed almost unanimously; two members only, Tallien and Thirson, daring to defend Marat.

The Commune and the Clubs immediately prepared to avenge the insult proffered to their leader, by the proscription of the Girondists. They organized their bands; they presented petitions to the Assembly, demanding the expulsion of their enemies; and at last, on the 10th of March, they began an insurrection, for the publicly avowed purpose of claiming, and, in case of a refusal, of themselves cutting off the heads of the Girondists. They failed, thanks to the courage of the Assembly, but, above all, to the energy of Danton; and the only result of this popular attack was to restore a sort of harmony between the different parties in the Convention, for their own security.

The reverses experienced on the Rhine and on the Meuse, the invasion of the south by the Spaniards, the insurrection of Lyons, and the civil war in La Vendée, announced almost simultaneously, again threw the people of Paris into a sort of frenzy; and the revolt of Dumouriez against the anarchy which threatened France with dissolution having been unsuccessful, the domination of Marat and his bands had become certain. On the 24th of April, he appeared before the tribunal, only to be honourably acquitted, and to be triumphantly carried by the mob to the Assembly, which, in their presence, he treated with the arrogance of a dictator.

The majority of the Assembly, however, could not but be convinced by these disgusting scenes, that the Girondists were right in the opinion which they had long expressed, that the authority of the Convention would never be acknowledged, and that it would be vain to expect obedience to its decrees, so long as the Commune of Paris was allowed to exist in its actual organization, and to exercise the powers it had usurped. At last, Guadet proposed two decrees; the first dismissing all the civil officials of Paris, and re-organizing the municipality; the second enjoining the substitutes\* of the members of the Convention to assemble at Bourges, and there to assume and exercise the national sovereignty, at the first news of any attempt against the freedom of the Convention. These decrees were not passed; but, on the motion of Barrère, a committee of twelve was appointed, with power to adopt all the measures necessary to preserve tranquillity,

\* The electors, in 1792, had chosen as many substitutes as they had deputies; so that, under any circumstances, France should never be without a Legislative Assembly.

and to inquire into the conduct of the Commune. All the members of the committee were immediately chosen among the Girondists. On that very evening, the members of the Commune met, to take into consideration the last measures of the Convention. The most violent resolutions were proposed; to get rid, in any way, of the Girondists; to enslave the Assembly; to get rid of the Convention itself, if it did not give up to national justice the new tyrants of the people. Such was the determination adopted by the Commune and the Clubs; and a few days afterwards, on the 31st of May, another insurrection had dictated to the Convention the proscription of the Girondists.

Neither Danton nor even Robespierre, who had so frequently been attacked and denounced by the Girondists, and who, probably, would have soon been the object of a formal accusation on the part of the new commission, had any share in the organization of this insurrection. On the contrary, both of them would, with the majority of the Convention, have successfully resisted the violence of the insurgents, had not the Girondists, to the very moment when the Assembly was invaded by the armed multitude, again and again compelled them, in their own defence, to complete the work of Marat, whom they abhorred, and of the Commune, which they despised.

M. de Lamartine concludes his account of the overthrow of the Girondists with a rapid review of their political career as a party, and pronounces on them a judgment which we deem both unjust and severe. In his appreciation of their acts, the Author does not take into due consideration the circumstances in the midst of which they were acting, the violent passions they had to contend with, or their invincible horror of shedding blood, and of the cannibals of September; a horror which statesmen can dissemble or restrain, but which honest men cannot even silence in their conscience, until they have brought down on the perpetrators of such atrocities the penalties awarded by the laws, and the execration of mankind. Such were Vergniaud, Gensonné, Condorcet, Isnard, all the Girondists. They were right in their constant denunciations of the sanguinary Marat and of his accomplices; and, although they were wrong in including Danton and Robespierre in the same category, they would have succeeded in their attempt to avenge outraged humanity, notwithstanding the popularity of both and the power of the Jacobins had not the reverses of the French armies, the invasion of the country, the accession of England to the European coalition, and the spread of the civil war, again thrown the whole population of Paris into a state of frenzy, which made them mistake the true friends of France for her enemies.

Danton and Robespierre are the statesmen of M. de Lamartine. They went on in their revolutionary career, without stopping to look back, or to deplore and avenge crimes in which they had no share. The latter particularly, who was a highly moral and virtuous man in his private as well as in his political life,\* suffered intensely at the sight of the atrocities perpetrated, and which he could not prevent. His statesmanship, however, did not allow him to yield to his feelings. When the death of the principal of the Girondists, and the flight of the others, began the reign of terror, of which the Committee of *Salut Public* was the hand, rather than the head, Danton and Robespierre, the two most influential of the committee, understood the necessity of the times, as M. de Lamartine says, and they complied with what the times required;—they showed themselves strong, inexorable, pitiless. They had the two qualifications indispensable to statesmen, ‘pour diriger les grands mouvements d’opinion auxquels ils participent;—l’intelligence de ces mouvements, et la passion dont ces mouvements sont l’expression chez un peuple. *Les Girondins n’avaient complètement ni l’un ni l’autre.*’† But, with these two qualifications, did they save, the republic? Both, no doubt, when they were giving way to the *passion* of the people, when they were allowing themselves to be carried at the head of the *mouvement*, fully intended to calm, to direct, and to stop the *passion* and the *mouvement* at a proper time; and they hoped to be able to do what the Girondists could not,—‘comprimer les convulsions de la France au dedans; faire triompher la nation au dehors; et procurer l’avancement d’une république régulière, en la préservant des rois et des démagogues.’ The impulsive and truly noble nature of Danton, however, at last revolts at the sight of the blood which covers his path; his eyes and his heart can find no relief, but in the green fields and groves watered by the limpid Aube. He repairs to Arcis; but, pursued in his solitude by visions of helpless and imploring victims, and by the sounds of alarm at the successes of the European coalition, he cannot long resist the generous impulse which urges him to fly back to Paris, and to devote all his energy to the cause of humanity. On his return, he dares to declare war against the Committee of *Salut Public*; and that Committee sends him to the very scaffold which he was determined to overthrow.

\* No one can read the many pages devoted by M. de Lamartine to the biography of Robespierre, in each of the volumes before us, without a feeling of respect and a sort of admiration for that man, so long an object of universal horror.

† Vol. vi. p. 152.

Robespierre did not demand ; he only assented to the punishment of Danton. The impassible nature of the deputy of Arras did not permit him to assign to its real causes the sudden change of his only rival in popularity. He attributed to personal hatred and to ambition, that which was the effect of a commendable sensibility, and, perhaps, of remorse. A few months had hardly elapsed, before this other statesman was doomed to the same death, and for the same cause. It was not the heart of Robespierre, it was his reason which, at last, revolted against the implacable rigours of the Committee and of its agents in the departments. He meditated, he prepared the punishment of the most cruel of those men, and the repression of the system of terror ; and it was in the midst of his meditations and of his preparations, that those very men pounced upon him and his friends, and sent them all to the guillotine, as the authors and the only supporters of that system !

The three last volumes of M. de Lamartine's work fully explain (perhaps too minutely) all the vicissitudes of those dissensions which deprived France and liberty of their best friends, and paved the way for the re-establishment of despotism. The most important service rendered by the publication of this work, is, that the public may at last know something of most of the actors in that dreadful tragedy—the French Revolution. We have here their *portraits* drawn with ability of the highest order, and an impartiality which is without example. We must, however, confess that we do not agree with the Author in many of his judgments ; and, we have no doubt that, had M. de Lamartine written less hastily, reflection would, in many instances have led him to very different conclusions. For our own part, we maintain, that truth, justice, and morality are the only sound bases of statesmanship ; that the Girondists were the real statesmen of the Convention, and, decidedly, the best men. We will say more ; we are sure, that, had M. de Lamartine lived in those eventful times, and been a member of that Assembly, he would have chosen his place among the friends of Vergniaud, and shared in their glorious struggle, and in their lamentable fate.

We had just written the last words of the preceding sentence, when the news of the long anticipated revolution in France interrupted our labours, and drew our attention from meditations on the past, to absorb it in the contemplation of the present, and in the investigation of the future. One month has hardly elapsed since the day when a noble people, rising again after eighteen years of oppression, gave the death-blow to monarchy, and scattered all the members of a dynasty as a whirlwind disperses the dust ; and we already see all the

thrones of the Continent tottering, all the sovereigns prostrated and constrained to surrender, and all the nations of Europe unanimously proclaiming the glorious advent of the era of universal freedom. In the whole history of the world, there is not a parallel instance of such a spontaneous movement of the human race, of such a general triumph of intelligence over blindness, of right over might, and of the will of the Lord in heaven over the will of the lords of this earth. '*Depositum potentes de sede, et exaltavit humiles.*'

And now, the historian of an already ancient revolution has become a principal actor in a new one. The censurer of the rulers of 1792 and 1793 is the prominent ruler of 1848; and a sort of providential retribution launches him, on a sudden, in the midst of the conflicting interests, of the opposite opinions, of the vindictive feelings, and of the convulsive passions, which were fatal to the generous men of whom he was so recently recording the virtues, the services, the faults, and the deplorable death. Like the Girondists, much more than the Girondists, M. de Lamartine belonged to the monarchical party, and had, to the last moment, striven to conciliate royalty with the free institutions claimed by the country. The insurrection of the 24th of February, 1848, seized him, as the insurrection of the 10th of August, 1792, had seized the Girondists, in the heat of the struggle against the treacherous and violent encroachments of the monarch, whom they wished to maintain, on the liberties and on the very existence of the nation; and the victorious people, repairing from the royal residence, deserted at their approach by its infatuated tenant, to the hall of the Legislative Assembly, announced to the legislators the overthrow of the throne, and intimated their will to have immediately appointed a Provisional Government, and to proclaim the Republic.

As on the 10th of August, 1792, so, in last February, a royal infant and a trembling mother took refuge in the Assembly, and begged for protection. The legislators of 1792, the Girondists who commanded the majority, had the hearts, the compassion, and the courage of men: they pitied, they protected the royal family, and, braving the menaces of the frantic multitude, who insisted on the immediate proclamation of the republic, dared to say, 'No! you may kill us; but you will not obtain from us a violation of our oaths, a dereliction of the duties imposed upon us by our constituents. They sent us here to defend the rights of all, as determined by the constitution. To decree the abrogation of the constitution, would be a usurpation of powers which belong to the nation alone. Let the nation decide that important question, and elect new

representatives to carry its will into execution, and we shall resign our powers ; but, until that is done, we shall remain unshaken in our principles, and resolute in our duties.'

How different the conduct of the deputies of 1848 ! That majority of three hundred, so devoted, so brave, so arrogant on the 22d of February, hardly noticed, on the 24th, the helpless widow and the infant children in behalf of whom she appealed to their fidelity and to their pity. At the first symptom of personal danger, they all deserted their post, without even giving a thought to the safety of the innocent victims of their corrupt and oppressive policy ; and left the people in possession of their seats and of their tribune. The people then elected by acclamation a Provisional Government, choosing all its members from among the leaders of the radical opposition.

The people of Paris now, mistrusting the Provisional Government as they mistrusted the Legislative Assembly in 1792, demanded that the Republic should immediately be proclaimed ; and the Provisional Government, after some resistance, yielded to the popular clamour, and, less scrupulous than the Girondists, usurped the national sovereignty, and founded the Republic on the violation of the rights of the people.

M. de Lamartine and his colleagues are now in the very identical position in which the Girondists were placed by the revolution of the 10th of August. His mild disposition, his moderation, his superior reason, are already engaged in a doubtful conflict against the wild, violent, and mad pretensions, not of the people, but of many worthy successors of the bad men of 1792. It is not M. Ledru Rollin, it is not Carnot, it is not Garnier Pagés, that are to be feared. Beneath them there are already lurking the disciples of Marat, of St. Just, of Babœuf, of Fouquier-Tinville, and of Hèbert. They have long been at work to undermine the foundations of social order ; and they were materially assisted in their undertaking by the corruption with which the late Government inoculated the whole of the superior and the middle classes of the French people. We, therefore, cannot dissemble our misgivings as to the future.

The late Government is alone answerable for the consequences of the feud between the middle and the lower classes, which for eighteen years it so perseveringly fostered, and in which it chose to seek and found its only support. The despotism of the younger branch of the Bourbons was not merely supported, but was also exercised, by the more opulent portion of the middle class ; not through any affection for the king, or any conviction of the soundness of his political system, but simply for their own selfish interest, the gratification of which was openly recommended by Guizot and all his colleagues, and zealously pursued by the two

hundred and forty thousand monopolisers of the political rights of the nation. The lower classes, after overthrowing the despot, are determined not to be again subjected to the domination of his tools. Unfortunately, they may be easily induced to think that, in order not to be 'subjected,' they must be 'masters'; and that if they be not the 'tyrants' of a class, they must again become its 'slaves.'

Re-actions are unavoidable in revolutions; we say more,—they are necessary, they are just: but they ought to be confined within the limits of necessity, of justice; and, above all, of the laws of humanity. This is the difficult task thrown upon the new government of France. The venerable Dupont de l'Eure, Arago, Lamartine, Crémieux, Marie, Garnier Pagés, Ledru Rollin himself, the Danton of the new Revolution, as Crémieux is its Vergniaud, and Lamartine its Fauchet, will devote all their energies to the accomplishment of this task. We have long known them, and we are convinced that to avert the recurrence of the calamities of a dreadful epoch, is the object of their earnest and indefatigable solicitude; but we know as well the others, and some men besides whose names are not yet prominently before the public, and who will soon, we fear, obtain a dangerous ascendancy.

Before we drop our pen, we beg to say a few words on ourselves. Our constant advocacy of the cause of freedom, of the cause of the people, of the cause of the many against the few, has sometimes been considered as bordering on ultra-democratic principles and revolutionary doctrines; because, in the middle of the concert of praises which the whole of the English daily press had so long continued, to the glory of the abominable men who plundered, enslaved, and crushed France, we boldly raised a discordant, an accusing voice. Events have proved that there was no exaggeration in our appreciation of the doctrines, of the misdeeds, and of the men, of the late government. We had no personal interest to promote by our hostility; no personal resentments to gratify; no ambitious aim to attain. We can say of ourselves what we have said of M. de Lamartine, and with much more reason. By our past history, by our family, we belong to the party of the victims of the Revolution. When looking back on the times which we have endeavoured to appreciate in these pages, we find our parents, our relations, and their friends, on the scaffolds or in the dungeons of the Reign of Terror. We do not know what Providence has in reserve for us; but, in whatever circumstances and situation we may be placed, we will remain faithful to the principles which we have hitherto maintained, and be victims rather than executioners.

**ART. VII.—1. *A Tabular Display of British Architecture.*** By Archibald Barrington, M.D.

2. ***Pocket Chart of British Architecture.*** By the Same.
3. ***Pocket Chart of Foreign Architecture.*** By the Same.

THESE are useful abstracts, somewhat roughly executed, but distinct and expressive. The examples are well selected, and if not sufficiently comprehensive and consecutive for the entire elucidation of a subject so wide and complicated, they will, in most cases, suggest the explanation, and direct the inquirer into the right track for obtaining more ample instruction. In our early days, when the love of the picturesque brought us into the presence of much venerable antiquity, with very slender means of ascertaining anything beyond its artistic qualities, such companions would have been of the greatest value; adding permanent to passing interest, and suggesting trains of thought and investigation that might have gone pleasantly hand in hand with lighter pursuits, and mingled profitably with more urgent studies. Then, however, such things were not; now they are in excess; and a diminution in the quantity might be advantageously compensated by an occasional improvement in the materials.

The plan of these manuals makes no pretension to originality. In the ‘Tabular Display,’ the examples of Saxon, Norman, Early English, Decorated, and Perpendicular, stand in collateral columns, and exhibit with much distinctness the characteristic features of the different periods; the centuries are marked, and the typography is varied in conformity with date and fashion. All this is cleverly managed, and the fractional illustration is, perhaps, as complete as scale and space would admit. The ‘Charts,’ though inferior in size, and less ornamentally got up, have with us, in some respects, the preference: they give a fair proportion of details, but their chief interest will be found in the examples of construction, which place before the eye, in one view, the progress and mutations of architectural invention. In this way, we have, for England, beside plans and parts, entire views of Kilpeck, Skelton, and Rotherham churches, excellent illustrations of very different styles. The front of Eton College exhibits what is here called the ‘Domestic Tudor;’ a phrase not, we think, very characteristically applied to a picturesque mixture of the palatial, baronial, and ecclesiastical. Crewe Hall stands as a fantastic exemplification of the so-called ‘Elizabethan.’

There is a fine instance of the 'broche' spire from Austrey church, Warwickshire; and a 'picture in little' of the steeple of St. Mary's, Oxford; than which there are few things finer in the whole range of constructive adaptation. It presents three striking features: there is, first, the plain, massive, yet not heavy, tower, with the slightest possible hint at decoration; on this rests the rich coronal of pinnacles, windows, and niches; and from the centre of these arises the well-proportioned spire. We are not aware that this noble structure has been adequately represented: the view in the 'Memorials of Oxford' is too much fore-shortened, and mars the fine proportion of the parts: the draught in Mackenzie and Pugin's 'Specimens,' has too much the air of a simple elevation, and fails in picturesque effect.

The 'Chart of Foreign Architecture' takes a wider scope of illustration; Egyptian, Cyclopean, Celtic, Indian, Greek, Roman. The lower and more modern department pleases us best. The Byzantine is exemplified in the very singular cathedral of San Ciriaco, at Ancona, described by Hope, but deserving ampler detail, as exhibiting the Greek cross under peculiar circumstances.\* The Romanesque cathedral of Worms, and the 'Pointed or Gothic' church of St. Ouen, are fairly represented.

\* Mr. Hope, in his description of this singular and very instructive edifice, gives rather more of detail and definition than is usual with him, and it may add something of practical usefulness to these cursory references, if we extract by way of annotation a portion of his observations, which would, however, have been much more effective had they been accompanied by sectional illustrations. 'Passing,' he says, 'along the shores of the Adriatic, from the north to the south of Ravenna, we find at Ancona, on the very apex of its soaring promontory, its ancient cathedral of St. Ciriacus, built at the end of the tenth, or beginning of the eleventh century,—when, as Muratori proves, Ancona still obeyed the Greek emperors,—one of the most perfect Greek crosses existing out of Byzantium. Four larger arches may here be seen, so insensibly approaching the pointed, as to leave it doubtful whether by accident or on purpose; and four small round arches, filling the angles between these, support a cupola ribbed internally: the transepts, each with a high crypt, containing, the one the tomb of St. Ciriacus, and the other that of St. Liberius, which cause the floor over them to be ascended by lofty flights of steps, and which end in semicircular absides. The pillars of the nave and transepts are of the red Verona marble, and the capitals, rude imitations, some of the Ionic, others of the Corinthian. The arches of the nave and transepts are all round-headed.' It is much to be regretted that the graphic illustrations to this in many respects admirable work, were not selected on a more strictly scientific principle. They supply 'elevations' in rather unnecessary abundance; the examples of ornamental parts are, though good, somewhat scanty; but of plans and sections, the return is, as nearly as possible, *nil*. In Moller's business-like work on Teutonic architecture, while the general effect is carefully exhibited, the principles of construction are clearly shown.

The villa and palazzo are illustrated by Florentine examples, but Italian architecture is a subject covering too large a space, both historical and territorial, for these meagre indications ; it has not, in fact, hitherto obtained that searching and complete examination to which it is every way entitled. Much, however, has been done ; Cicognara, Cresy, Woods, d'Agincourt, Gally Knight, and others, have collected largely and learnedly ; but a survey, at once comprehensive and discriminating, of this various and productive region yet remains to be taken, and we could name one at least among our antiquarian *dilettanti*, whom we believe to be fairly competent to a task of which the difficulties are not to be met by common-places. That superficial sort of criticism which may be sufficient for average purposes, will break down in the attempt to carry out, fully and distinctly, such an investigation as that now suggested. The accumulation of facts and dates is a simple affair of learning and labour, and we have among us many well-informed men, to whom this part of the business is easy and familiar ; but the combination of these indispensable qualities with critical sagacity and descriptive power, is a much rarer gift : that it exists we have no doubt, and when circumstances arise to call it forth, we shall give it a cordial greeting. As an illustration of the necessity for such a process, and of the uncertainty of opinion, not merely public, but professional, in the absence of all recognised authority in these matters ; we need only instance the extravagant admiration lavished, both by contemporaries and successors, on that great school of Italian architects to which Palladio has given a somewhat hackneyed name, as contrasted with the neglect into which it has now fallen. Rejecting both extremes, we yet look in vain to the productions of these celebrated men, for decided originality or skilful imitation. They seem to have fluctuated between different systems, till they completely lost sight of simplicity and specific character. Palladio sometimes attempted to obviate difficulties and obtain effect from the exaggeration of a single feature, impressive in itself, but awkward in its misapplication, as when, in the church of the Redentore and other edifices of the same days, he flanked his central pediment, by a half-pediment on either side. His Olympic Theatre at Vicenza, outrages every element of taste and adaptation, in its accumulation of inappropriate and injurious ornament—‘trumpery’ is the term applied to it by Woods, a fair and moderate critic. After all, the painters and sculptors of Italy, those men of unrivalled and universal genius, seem to have originated some of the most impressive features of its architecture. To Bramante,

Michael Angelo, and others of kindred, if not equal mind, that glorious country is mainly indebted for the picturesque character of its palaces and its villas.

These expositions, with their diversified examples and orderly arrangement, have suggested to us thoughts and recollections not precisely within the scope of our original design. We have found difficulty in accounting for the steady progress of improvement up to a certain point, and its abrupt termination there, unless re-animated by the infusion of a new principle, or, at least, by some effective modification of an old one. We may, for instance, trace the primary characteristics of Greek architecture, the architrave and the column, from the elementary Hut to the magnificent ranges of the Olympeum: up to that point new and beautiful applications of the original principles were successively produced, but beyond it, so far as we recollect, improvement ceased and the art retrograded. With the introduction—we say nothing about the *invention*—of the arch, a new progress began, and in the effort to combine the two systems, a series of gorgeous and impressive erections resulted from the impulse thus given. The train of illustration thus briefly indicated, might be advantageously pursued throughout the successive periods of architectural development, and on some future occasion we may resume it, more especially in its application to present circumstances, but our actual limits are defined, and the publications before us are not precisely those to which a disquisition of this kind can be advantageously appended.

Each series is accompanied by a small pamphlet or 'Manual,' comprising much clear information in a small compass.

## Brief Notices.

---

*Views A-Foot; or, Europe seen with Knapsack and Staff.* By J. Bayard Taylor. With a Preface by N. P. Willis. In Two Parts. London: Wiley and Putnam. 1847.

MR. WILLIS tells us, in his preface, that 'Mr. Taylor's poetical productions, while he was still a printer's apprentice, made a strong impression on the writer's mind, and he gave them their due praise accordingly in the newspaper of which he was then editor. Some correspondence ensued, and other fine pieces of writing strengthened the admiration thus awakened; and when the young poet-mechanic came to the city, and modestly announced the bold determination of visiting foreign lands, with means, if they could be got, but with reliance on manual labour if they could not; the writer, understanding the man, and seeing how capable he was of carrying out his manly and enthusiastic scheme, and that it would work uncorruptingly for the improvement of his mind and character, counselled him to go. He went: his book tells how successfully for all his purposes. He has returned, after two years' absence, with large knowledge of the world, of men, and of manners, with a pure, invigorated, and healthy mind; having passed all this time abroad, and seen and accomplished more than most travellers, *at the cost of only five hundred dollars, and this sum earned on the road.* This, in the writer's opinion, is a fine instance of character and energy. The book, which records the difficulties and struggles of a printer's apprentice achieving this, must be interesting to Americans. The pride of the country is in its self-made men.' What Mr. Willis says of 'the country' is true of *the world*; and we rejoice in the interesting narrative before us. Apart from its value to the many, in circumstances similar to the author's, who desire to undertake the same romantic journey, it is far superior to travels in general. The views are bold and free, if not always correct, and the style is brisk and vivacious. We do not wonder at Mr. Willis's sanguine expectations respecting the future fame of the author.

---

*One Hundred and Twenty-nine Letters from the Rev. John Newton, late Rector of St. Mary Woolnoth, London, to the Rev. William Bull, of Newport Pagnell.* London: Hamilton, Adams, and Co.

THESE names are well known, and the nature and qualities of the letters may be easily imagined. Mr. Bull took the charge of the Independent congregation at Newport about the time that Mr. Newton

became curate at Olney. They were soon acquainted with each other, and ultimately became attached and permanent friends. The letters are such as good and familiar men used to write in those days. Mr. Newton's epistolary ease and wisdom are extensively known and appreciated, and many will doubtless welcome these additional specimens of them.

---

*The Life and Adventures of Zamba, an African Negro King; and his Experience of Slavery in South Carolina.* Written by himself. Corrected and arranged by Peter Neilson. pp. 258. London: Smith Elder, and Co.

THIS professes to be the history of an African prince, born in 1780, whose territory lay on the south bank of the river Congo, and who was treacherously treated and sold as a slave by an American captain at Charlestown in South Carolina. As a narrative, is very interesting; and, as an exhibition of slavery, it is calculated to teach and stimulate the friends of those that are wrongfully held captive.

We have no reason to dispute the accuracy of the title, but certain parts of the story have an air of improbability. We bear in mind, however, that if fiction is often like truth, truth is often like fiction. But it is to be regretted, as the editor remarks, that the statements of 'this poor African, have not been written throughout in his own phraseology.' We have a great abhorrence of corrections, and alterations, and additions, at all times, and in a case like the present, our dislike is increased by the peculiar nature and authorship of the narrative.

---

*Discourses by the late Archibald Bennie, D.D., F.R.S.E.* To which is prefixed a Memoir of the Author. London: Blackwood and Sons.

DR. BENNIE was a popular minister of the Church of Scotland, whose comparatively sudden removal, in the prime of life, left a large circle of admirers to mourn a bereavement of more than common severity. Judging from the specimens of his ministrations before us, for the most part appearing without the advantage of his own revision, he must have been 'an able minister of the New Testament.'

The sermons are on topics of primary importance, dealing, in general, with the first principles and broadest relations of the gospel. The sentiments are decidedly evangelical. The thoughts, if not profound or original, are clear and sound. The style is luminous and bold. Thus characterized, they are likely to be useful; and to the author's late hearers will doubtless prove a very acceptable legacy. May they bring to effectual remembrance many vital truths which, when heard from the pulpit, were perhaps heard in vain!

---

*The Scientific Phenomena of Domestic Life, familiarly explained.* By Charles Foote Gower, Esq. Second Edition. London : Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans. 1847.

THIS is a charming effort to make the objects of our familiar interest the texts of important instruction. The author takes the reader through the 'Bed-room,' 'Breakfast-parlour,' 'Kitchen,' 'Study ;' accompanies him in the Morning Walk ;' stands with him on the 'Sea Shore ;' contemplates the 'Summer's Evening,' &c., and expounds for his benefit the laws of the material world. It is just the book that multitudes of parents and friends would be glad to present to their offspring and acquaintance.

---

*A New Solution, in Part, of the Seals, Trumpets, and other Symbols, of the Revelation of St. John : being an attempt to prove that, as far as they are fulfilled, they denote the Rise, Increase, and Maturity of the Man of Sin, and the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ for his Destruction.* By the Rev. R. Gascoyne, M.A. London : Longman and Co.

WE have copied the title of this little work that our readers may have the benefit of the author's own statement of his general views. It would be ridiculous to attempt to discuss the merits of such a work in a few lines. We shall therefore content ourselves with saying that Mr. Gascoyne appears to have brought to his task intelligence, careful thought, and more freedom and independence of mind than are always displayed. Some of the opinions, as proceeding from a churchman, will probably surprise many readers.

---

*Sketches of Eminent Medical Men.* London : Religious Tract Society.

ONE of the Monthly Series, containing the lives, clearly and judiciously written, of ten medical men of great ability and fame, and, for the most part, decided and eminent piety.

---

*Memoir of Lady Warwick : and her Diary.* London : Religious Tract Society.

'LADY WARWICK,' says Dr. Walker, who preached her funeral sermon, 'had never been heard blamed but for two faults: 1, excess of charity; 2, defect of anger.' Without vouching for such blamelessness, it is plain that she was a very good and holy woman. At the same time, the 'Diary' might have been better if abridged.

*Man's Right to God's Word.* Translated from the French Prize Essay of M. Boucher. With a Recommendatory Preface by the Hon. and Rev. H. Montague Villiers, M.A., Rector of St. George's Bloomsbury. London: J. F. Shaw.

THIS essay obtained the prize offered by a French journal in 1840. It is, as Mr. Villiers remarks, 'correct in argument, and sound in doctrine ;' but we cannot assent to the praise of the translator, who speaks of the 'power of its advocacy, and the eloquence and beauty of its composition.' It is sometimes very shallow, and never remarkably profound. So far as it goes, however, (within the compass no one could do justice to the theme) it will serve to suggest, in a popular and vigorous manner, the common topics of such an argument.

---

*Sketches of Protestantism in Italy, Past and Present; including a Notice of the Origin, History, and Present State of the Waldenses.* By Robert Baird, D.D., New York. Glasgow and London: William Collins.

THIS work consists of three parts. The first relates to the rise, progress, and suppression, of the reformation in Italy; the second describes the state of things in Italy since the reformation; the third contains a historical and descriptive account of the Waldenses.

The work has a peculiar value at the present time, and true protestants will peruse its pages with lively interest. The author has brought together much information with a careful hand, and presents it in a cheerful spirit. He is no *croaker*,—a very important fact in connexion with such a subject at this particular time. We commend the volume as a remarkably cheap account of grave and vital matters.

---

*Desultory Notes on the Government and People of China, and of the Chinese Language; illustrated with a Sketch of the Province of Kwang-Tung, shewing its Division into Departments and Districts.* By Thomas Taylor Meadows, Interpreter to Her Britannic Majesty's Consulate at Canton. London: Allen and Co.

THOSE who open this volume merely for the purpose of amusement, or of finding in it a general delineation, or even a few graphic sketches, of Chinese customs and manners, will be disappointed. The author's object is evidently far less to amuse than to instruct. He writes, throughout, like a person who, in grappling with the difficulties of the Chinese language, and diving into the real principles which regulate the government, and the conduct, both social and commercial, of the people, had left himself very little time or inclination for amusement. Evidently desirous that others should share with him in the benefits of his observation and experience, he is as business-like

in his authorship as, we have no doubt, he is in the discharge of his official duties ; and those who are studying the Chinese language, or about to visit the country, will find in his volume many practical hints of great value. Besides four beautiful coloured engravings of Mandarins in their native costume, the volume contains various grammatical and official tables, together with a coloured map of the province of Kwang-Tung, of which Canton is the capital. Some of the author's observations on the opium and slave trade, as well as on religion, had far better have been omitted ; but, with these exceptions, we cordially recommend his work to our readers.

---

*Thirty Sermons on the Life of David, and on the Twenty-third and Thirty-second Psalms.* By the Rev. C. M. Fleury, A.M. Dublin : James M'Glashan.

WE have read this volume with sincere admiration of the fervent piety and evangelical faith of the author, and are satisfied of his desire to promote the eternal welfare of his readers. We cannot, therefore but deeply regret that sermons, so pure in doctrine, and so devout and practical in their tendency, should be profaned and disfigured by party politics of the most wretched kind. If members of the Irish Church have not sufficient courage at once to give up 'the wages of unrighteousness,' they ought, at least, in all decency, to keep silence on the subject. That those who are living on the wrongs of Ireland, should, in the prospect of a possible removal of those wrongs, begin to play the martyr, and speak of themselves as men who for conscience' sake are to be deprived of all justice and right, is more than we can well endure. We sincerely hope, therefore, that the author, who appears in every other respect to be well worthy of his office, will not suffer so foul a blot to sully the pages of his next edition.

---

*The Pilgrimage : How God was found of him that sought him not ; or, Rationalism in the Bud, the Blade, and the Ear.* A Tale for our Times. Translated from the German of C. A. Weldenhahn. By Mrs. Stanley Carr. Edinburgh : Oliver and Boyd.

WE candidly confess that we have never yet been able to reconcile religious novels either with our religious feelings or our literary taste. If religion does not spoil the novel, the novel invariably spoils the religion, by rendering it romantic and sentimental ; and nothing we have hitherto read has convinced us that the 'words of truth and soberness' can be fitly conveyed to the mind through such a vehicle. It is but justice to our author to say that he has contrasted the proud egotism of Rationalism with the self-annihilating power of the Gospel, in a very striking and interesting manner. But

his readers, after all, are likely to learn from him quite as much romance as religion ; and, if extraordinary adventures like those of his hero are necessary to conversion, the period must be very distant in which 'all men shall be brought to the knowledge of the truth.' The author's sentiments, moreover, though on the whole evangelical, are, in many respects, exceedingly narrow and contracted, and, in one or two instances, if we mistake not, both theologically and philosophically false. He seems to think that there is no such thing as political or religious freedom without what is technically called 'free-thinking ;' he sneers at Englishmen who travel abroad without a knowledge of Continental languages, as if a German or Frenchman in England, without a knowledge of English, were a thing never known ; and, though he admits that rationalism is no bar to confirmation or the ministry in the Lutheran Church, he seems to regard a disrelish for Lutheranism as tantamount to infidelity.

The fair Translator has discharged her office with great spirit and ability, if we except two or three Scotticisms, for the removal of which we hope the requisite care will not, in a future edition, be '*awanting*.'

---

*Discourses, Doctrinal and Practical.* By the late Rev. James Jeffrey, Greenock, *With a Memoir of his Life.* Edinburgh : William Oliphant.

MR. Jeffrey was a minister of the Relief Church, and had a considerable share of popularity as a preacher, which, as appears from this volume, was chiefly based on the more solid excellences of pulpit address. The discourses before us are eighteen in number, on subjects of primary importance, they are marked by correctness and prominence of evangelical doctrine, perspicuity of style, and directness of tendency to affect the heart and conscience. They can scarcely fail to administer to the spiritual good of attentive readers.

---

*Comfortable Words for Christian Parents, bereaved of Little Children.*  
By John Brown, D.D. Edinburgh : William Oliphant.

THREE discourses founded on *Jeremiah* xxxi. 15—17, and composed on the occasion of the death of the Author's youngest daughter. They are in matter, manner, and spirit, eminently adapted to meet the case of the interesting class for whose consolation they are designed.

---

*Zadoc, the Outcast of Israel; A tale.* By Charlotte Elizabeth. Third Edition. London : Aylott and Jones. 1847.

ONE of the first and best of Charlotte Elizabeth's productions, and well calculated to excite interest in the welfare of the Jews.

*A Jubilee Memorial; being the substance of Two Sermons, preached at Kingsland Chapel, June 16, 1844, on occasion of the Jubilee of that place of Worship, with a statement relative to its Origin, Founders, and First Pastor, &c.* By Thomas Aveling. pp. 99. London: Snow.

THIS little work contains two faithful sermons on 'Joyful Recognition of the Divine Goodness,' and 'Revival of Religion,' with a brief, but interesting sketch of the history of a sanctuary in which God had given many and evident tokens of his presence.

---

*Reality of the Gracious Influence of the Holy Spirit.* By the late John Jamieson, D.D., F.R.S. and F.S., A.S. *With Memoir of the Rev. Andrew Somerville,* pp. 456. London: Hamilton, Adams, and Co.

THIS work is 'the result of the cogitations of half a century.' Although posthumous, it was carefully prepared for the press by the author. It contains fifteen dissertations bearing the following titles—'On the Importance of the Doctrine of the Operation of the Spirit.' 'On the Promise of the Spirit to the Church, and the Design of this Gift.' 'Objections to the Doctrine of Divine Influence Considered.' 'Arguments from Analogy in Support of the Doctrine of the Spirit's Efficacious operation on the Heart.' 'On the Miraculous Gifts of the Spirit.' 'The Necessity of Divine Influence proved from Facts.' 'Miracles not the Foundation of Saving Faith.' 'On the Design and Use of Miracles.' 'On the Demonstration of the Spirit.' 'The Reality of Divine Influence proved from the Figurative Language of Scripture.' 'The Reality of Divine Influence proved from the Simple Language of Scripture.' 'The Reality of Divine Influence proved from Experience.'

Of the work thus divided, we cannot speak in the terms of Dr. Mitchell, one of the persons into whose custody it was committed by its author. We should hesitate to apply *all* the expressions 'original, acute, extended, discriminative, ingeniously critical, and powerfully argumentative.' Dr. Jamieson's mind was rather vigorous than profound, direct than comprehensive. He puts many things in a clear and forcible way, and always exhibits a strong attachment to the characteristic doctrines of revelation; but the work, though much superior to the general class of theological publications, does not, we think, sustain its pretensions. It is a sound, wise, and cleverly written doctrinal treatise, and that is all.

The profits of the publication are to be devoted to the benefit of superannuated ministers, and the orphan children of ministers of the Secession Church.

---

*Biographical and Critical Notices of the British Poets of the Present Century, with Specimens of their Poetry.* By A. D. Toovey. London: Kent and Richards. 1848.

WE question whether a cotemporary can ever so estimate the poetry of his age as to succeed altogether in such a work as the present. Mr. Toovey, then, need not be ashamed if he has to some extent failed. He has given us in a small volume many of the best known passages of the standard poetry of the last thirty years, accompanying his selections with bits of criticism, but he has not produced what he hints at—a successor to Thomas Campbell's specimens. That would have been valuable and popular. This is but a moderately comprehensive volume of elegant extracts—not always selected happily either as to authors, or as to the specimens chosen from each. Why, for instance, do Harris, Hannah More, Lord Robertson, Peter Still (!), Shee, and Emerson, (*British poets?*) figure in pages which have no room for Keble, Elizabeth Barrett, her husband Browning, and Bailey, the author of 'Festus;' all of whom have written poetry, and one of whom has been called the truest poet of the age?

---

*A Harmony of the Four Gospels; in the Authorized Version following the Harmony of the Gospels in Greek.* By Edward Robinson, D.D., LL.D. With Explanatory Notes, etc. London: Religious Tract Society.

DR. ROBINSON'S valuable 'Harmony' is already well known in England. The author's patient habits of research, large learning, and intimate knowledge of Palestine, have enabled him to produce a 'Harmony,' which, although it has had two hundred predecessors, 'contains some new views, and some new illustrations of old ones. This is true, especially in respect to the transactions during the last six months of our Lord's ministry.' We rejoice, therefore, that the present volume makes his labours available to many, to whom the original work would have been useless. We bear testimony to the care with which the editor has executed his part, but we regret that he has added to, and even altered, Robinson's text and notes, on some occasions by extracts from Gresswell and Wieseler, without distinctly marking each case as it occurs. The reader has a right to know whose opinion he is receiving; and the practice becoming prevalent of publishing 'amended' editions, without plainly indicating every amendment, and its source, we must regard as unscholarly in the extreme.

---

## Literary Intelligence.

*Just Published.*

Ideas, or Outlines of a New System of Philosophy. By Antoine Claude Gabriel Jobert.

The Ecclesiastical Polity of the New Testament unfolded, and its Points of Coincidence or Disagreement with prevailing Systems indicated. By Samuel Davison, L.L.D.

Revelations of Ireland in the past generation. By D. Owen Madden, Esq., of the Inner Temple.

A History of the Prices, and of the state of the Circulation, from 1839 to 1847, inclusive, with a general Review of the Currency Question, and Remarks on the Operation of the Act 7 & 8 Vic. c. 32. By Thomas Tooke, Esq., F.R.S. Being a Continuation of the History of Prices from 1793 to 1839.

The Magnet of the Gospel. By J. R. Balme.

Journal of an Expedition into the Interior of Tropical Australia in search of a Route from Sydney to the Gulf of Carpentaria. By Lieut. Col. Sir T. L. Mitchell, Kt., D.C.L., Surveyor General of New South Wales.

The Claims of the Hebrew Language, &c. By T. Hathaway.

Music and Education. By Dr. Mainzer.

The Modern Orator. Part 12. Charles James Fox.

Six Letters on Dr. Todd's Discourses on the Prophecies relating to Anti-christ in the Apocalypse. By E. B. Denison, M.A.

National Cyclopaedia of Useful Knowledge. Part 14. Castanospernum — Cheiromys.

Pictorial Bible. Part 12.

Hints for the Times, on the Religions of Sentiment, Form, and of Feeling, contrasted with Vital Godliness. By Rev. George Smith, M.A.

Plain Facts for the People in Relation to the Tithes and Revenues of the Church. By J. Henry Tillett.

A Catechism on the Map of the Holy Land, in Connexion with the principal Events of the Old Testament, and in the Life of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Travels in Siberia, including Excursions northwards, down the Obi, to the Polar Circle, and southwards to the Chinese Frontier. By Adolph Erman. Translated from the German by William Desborough Cooley. 2 Vols.

Cosmos : A Sketch of a Physical description of the Universe. By Alexander Von Humboldt. Vol. 2. Translated under the superintendence of Lieutenant Colonel Edward Sabine, R.A.

Some further portions of the Diary of Lady Willoughby, which relate to her domestic history and to the events of the latter years of the reign of King Charles I., the Protectorate and the Restoration.

Arthur Frankland, or the experience of a Tragic Poet. A Tale.

Letters to a Mother on the Management of herself and her children in health and disease ; embracing the subjects of Pregnancy, Childbirth, Nursing, Food, Exercise, Bathing, Clothing, etc. ; with Remarks on Chloroform. By J. T. Conquest, M.D., F.L.S.

The History of the Church and Court of Rome, from the Establishment of Christianity under Constantine, to the present time. By the Rev. H. C. O'Donnaghue, A.M. 2 Vols.

The History of the Revival and Progress of Independency in England, since the period of the Reformation. By Joseph Fletcher. Vol. III.